

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October; the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable under war conditions.

The Classical Review

MAY 16 1942

Editors { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge
C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A., F.B.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society
J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.), PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., PROF. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A., F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.), representing the Council of the Classical Association
PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A., E. A. BARBER, M.A., F.B.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society

With the co-operation of
PROF. J. L. MICHIE, University of Queensland, PROF. E. K. RAND, Harvard University, and PROF. B. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

Volume LVI

MARCH 1942

Number 1

CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| NOTES AND NEWS | 1 |
| XPHN: EXPHN. M. PLATNAUER | 2 |
| ATTIC 'H AND 'HN, 'I WAS'. E. HARRISON | 6 |
| THEOCRITEA. M. PLATNAUER | 9 |
| THE TWENTY-SECOND IDYLL OF THEOCRITUS. A. S. F. GOW | 11 |
| NOTES ON VIRGIL. H. MATTINGLY | 18 |
| A FRENCH BROADSHEET OF 1582 ON LATIN PRONUNCIATION. F. BRITAIN | 20 |
| REVIEWS: | |
| <i>Aeschylus and Athens</i> (Thomson), A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE, 21; <i>Sophocles, The Antigone</i> (Murray); <i>Sophocles, Poet and Dramatist</i> (Bates); <i>Tragedy of Destiny</i> (Williams), H. D. F. KITTO, 27; <i>Θούκρατος</i> (Venizelos), A. W. GOMME, 29; <i>Ontwikkelingsmomenten in de Zielkunde van Aristoteles</i> (Nuyens), K. O. BRINK, 31; <i>Das Beispiel der Geschichte im politischen Denken des Isocrates</i> (Schmitz-Kahlmann), A. W. GOMME, 32; <i>Dionysos of Halicarnassus</i> ; <i>Roman Antiquities</i> , III (Cary), A. H. McDONALD, 33; <i>Remains of Old Latin</i> , IV (Warmington), H. MATTHIASOLY, 34; <i>Die Syntax der Tempora und Modi der ältesten lateinischen Inschriften</i> (Sieger), O. SKUTCH, 36; <i>Medieval Latin Studies</i> (Lind), R. M. HENRY, 37; <i>Tarente</i> (Wuilleumier), D. B. HARDIN, 37; <i>A History of Messenia</i> (Roebuck), F. W. WALBANK, 39; <i>The Roman Citizenship</i> (Shaw-Win-White), A. F. GILES, 40; <i>Rome and China</i> (Teggart), J. L. MYERS, 42; <i>Histoire de Rome</i> (Pignani), G. H. STEVENSON, 44; <i>La crisi del Principato nell' anno 69</i> D.C. (Zancan), G. H. STEVENSON, 44; <i>The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin</i> (Sturtevant), J. W. PIRIE, 45; <i>Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century</i> (Weiss), S. GABELE, 47; <i>Some School Books</i> , D. S. COLMAN, 48. | |
| SHORT REVIEWS | 49 |
| SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS | 50 |
| CORRESPONDENCE | 55 |
| BOOKS RECEIVED | 55 |

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : HUMPHREY MILFORD

Price 6s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$2.55. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$5.32

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3. 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1. 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Mr. J. J. R. Bridge, Mutcombe, Fairfield Road, Bath, and Miss N. C. Jolliffe, Girton College, Cambridge) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

B. H. BLACKWELL LTD., 48-51 BROAD STREET, OXFORD

will shortly publish a CATALOGUE (No. 485) OF GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS and Works relating to Classical Antiquity, including the Library of the late WILLIAM ALEXANDER GOLIGHER, Litt.D., Regius Professor of Greek, University of Dublin, 1934-40.

Under recent Government Regulations we are compelled to make a charge for our Catalogues. Applications for the above must be accompanied by a 2d. stamp.



T

A
Ass
fron
Adv
Elic

TH
Her
An
foun
in
to
Sch
not
54)
of
and
Her
the
ver
our
me
wit
Cyt

TH
Stu
a
cat
fes
at
pr
of
to
to
W
ser
Su
pic
fun

TH
co
of
te
19
in
lu
ev

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

MARCH 1942

NOTES AND NEWS

A GENERAL Meeting of the Classical Association is to be held in Cambridge from 14 to 16 April. The Presidential Address will be delivered by Mr. T. S. Eliot on the afternoon of 15 April.

THE November number (lviii) of *Hermathena* has for sub-title '350th Anniversary Number' in honour of the foundation of Trinity College, Dublin, in 1592, and gives a good deal of space to articles on some of the College's Schools. The classical articles are noticed elsewhere in this journal (p. 54), but special mention may be added of the versions from one language to another which are a regular part of *Hermathena*'s well assorted fare. Though the present number has no Greek verses, it has Latin elegiacs for 'O God, our help in ages past' and Latin hexameters for a score of lines, beginning with 'Chief isle of the embowered Cyclades', from Keats's *Hyperion*.

THE latest volume (ii) of *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* is likewise a special issue inasmuch as it is dedicated to William Scott Ferguson, Professor of Ancient and Modern History at Harvard, whose work needs no praise, for it is well known to students of Greek history; and they will be glad to see the list of his writings, from 1898 to 1940, which holds the place of honour. With a volume of *Athenian Studies presented to Professor Ferguson* a series of Supplementary Volumes makes an auspicious start. Both books will receive further notice in *C.R.*

THE *South African Architectural Record* continues its enterprising series of issues dealing with ancient architecture. In the January number of 1941 Rex Martienssen, under the heading 'Greek Cities', surveys briefly but lucidly, with good illustrations, the evidence for town-planning in the

Aegean area from Minoan Gournia to Hellenistic Priene. He appraises his material with an architect's eye, and students of ancient life may learn much from this article.

THE death of Sir Thomas Little Heath has deprived learning of one of the few men—are there ever half a dozen alive at one time?—who could fully understand and appreciate the Greek mathematicians. Born in 1861, of a family which loved learning, he had the good fortune to be taught by an intelligent schoolmaster, under whom he devoured classics and mathematics. Passing from his school, which was at Caistor, to Clifton, he devoured more, and coming to Cambridge he continued the process, incidentally getting a reputation for universal ability; one admirer said that 'he would have secured a good First in Cherokee' had there been such a Tripos. As it was, he accumulated Firsts in Classics and Mathematics, and in 1885 wrote an essay or thesis for a Fellowship at Trinity. The subject was Diophantos of Alexandria, and thus Heath was fairly started on his specialty. Incidentally, he had passed brilliantly into the Civil Service, in 1884, and there he proved a most useful official and rose high, as he deserved to do. By way of relaxation, he wrote books on Greek mathematicians, Apollonios of Perga (1896), Archimedes (1897), Euclid (1908), followed a dozen years later by his annotated text of Euclid I. It was his good fortune that he was contemporary with a handful of excellent Continental scholars, including Heiberg. To speculate how far he would have gone in his favourite subject had he worked quite alone is idle; he had the skill to appreciate and use their results, thus facilitating his own labours, adding to them and having what he did added to by them. His masterpiece is generally considered to be his *History of Greek Mathematics*

(1921), but there were few or no years in which he did not put forth books, articles, reviews, and other contributions to this fascinating branch of Science conjoined with the Humanities.

Perhaps it may be allowed to one who combines respect for mathematics with singular incompetence in them to mention an outstanding virtue of Heath's work. His style is so lucid that at least those parts which are not wholly technical are perfectly intelligible to the sorriest stumbler over the *Pons Asinorum*.

H. J. R.

THE subjects of two recent British Academy memoirs, George Macdonald and David Ansell Slater, were connected by one circumstance: they served as lecturers at Glasgow together, one in Greek, the other in Latin, one among his own people, the other commanding himself as a stranger. They were very different men and their lives took very different courses. Macdonald was severe, masterful, and precise; for fourteen years he was the deputy head, for twelve more the head, of a Government office, and in his leisure he made himself an acknowledged master in two fields—ancient numismatics (a study suggested to him by his opportunities at Glasgow, where he found the Hunterian Collection neglected and left it as it is to-day) and the archaeology of Roman Scotland. To them he brought the same common sense and clarity of mind with which he framed a minute or drafted a report for the Scottish Education Department, and in them, as in his official life, he was quick to discover general principles in a maze of detail. He was no armchair archaeologist; he had examined every yard of the Wall and spent much of his spare time on excavation, but his public duty never suffered, and it would be unjust to him

if his eminence in scholarship obscured his services to education in Scotland. Slater was shy and diffident, a lover of poetry and something of a poet. His life was academic, as he wished it to be. He was a professor for nearly forty years, at Cardiff, at Bedford College in London, and at Liverpool, and none was ever more devoted to his work. The sensitive appreciation of Latin poetry for which his pupils remember him showed itself in his occasional papers and in his translations; to the quality of his more austere scholarship his work on Ovid testifies.

THE 'necrological' section of Bursian's *Jahresbericht* for 1940, Band 271, which purports to have been issued in the first month of the war, gives memoirs of some scholars who had died within the last few years. The work of Edwin Mayser is valued by all papyrologists, that of Wilhelm Heraeus by all latinists; Joseph Schrijnen, of Nijmegen, was prominent in comparative philology; Anders Björn Drachmann and Karl Hude, both of Copenhagen, were prolific writers, and Hude's texts of great authors of Greek prose are in general use; Håkan Sjögren, of Upsala, had put lovers of Cicero's letters very much in his debt. Why Alfred Edward Housman is omitted will be told in the next number of *C.R.*.

Another great loss to classical scholarship is Eduard Norden, who died in Switzerland last year.

FROM A CORRESPONDENT:

My texts of Aeschylus give *θάλασσα* δ' οὐκέτ' ἦν ὁδεῖν in *Persae* 419, and my commentaries vouchsafe no note on the syntax. In Blomfield I find 'θάλασσαν δ' Ald.' (which mends the grammar but mars the metre): 'θάλασσαν, sine δ', Turn. Steph.'; but the δ' is hard to spare. Can any of your readers help?

XPHN: EXPHN

THE object of this article is to answer, if they can be answered, the following questions:

- (1) Of the forms *χρῆν* and *ἐχρῆν* is only one correct; if so, which?
- (2) If both forms are correct, was one

preferred either in all periods of Greek literature or in some particular period?

- (3) If both forms are correct, was one preferred in some particular type of literature?

ured land.
er of
His
it to
forty
ge in
none
work.
Latin
umber
onal
the
ership

Before examining the evidence it may be worth while saying that, granted both forms are found in extant MSS., the form *έχρην* is etymologically incorrect. *χρῆν* is no more than a crasis of *χρῆν* *θην*, just as *χρῆναι* is a crasis of *χρῆν* *είναι*; the augment, therefore, is due merely to a false analogy with *έδει*. (If nothing else shows that, the accent does: had the augment been genuine the word should have been *έχρην*.) But what is etymologically incorrect can only too often be found in practice, and in this case it cannot be denied that the form *έχρην* is found in manuscripts and found often.

The evidence falls into two categories: (1) (a) epigraphic and (b) papyrological; (2) that of the continuous MSS.

(1) This being first-hand is of the greatest importance, or would be were there more of it. Unfortunately for our purposes the verb is very rare both in inscriptions and in papyri.¹ (a) *χρῆν* occurs only in *IG. ii. 4311. 1*, an inscription datable to the third century B.C., while *έχρην* is found only on a stone of the late second century A.D. (*Inscr. v. Magnesia*, 114. 4; W. H. Buckler in *Anatolian Studies presented to W. M. Ramsay*, 30). (b) *χρῆν* seems never to figure in papyri and *έχρην* only four times (*Ox. Pap.* 900, 1163, 2039, and *Pap. Masp.* 67353 A 32). Of these four papyri the earliest is of the fourth century A.D.

(2) Here we have possible MS. corruption to confuse the issue. Because a MS. of the twelfth or thirteenth century presents us with a certain form of a word we cannot argue that the form in question was that used by the author. In many cases the forms employed by, and natural to, the Byzantine scribes ousted those which we have every reason to believe were in use at the time of, and therefore presumably used by, the original writer. If proof is needed this was proved conclusively by Rutherford in *The New Phrynicus* (pp. 429 sqq.) apropos of the so-called 'short' forms of the optative of contracted verbs and of the first aorist optative of verbs in

-ω and -μι. How, then, when we find *χρῆν* or *έχρην* in a MS., can we know which form the author used? The answer (it is Rutherford's) is: we can know only where we have metre to guide us; i.e., in this instance, where *χρῆν* (but not *έχρην*) will scan, we may take it the author wrote *χρῆν*; where *έχρην* (but not *χρῆν*) will scan, we may take it he wrote *έχρην*. (I have supposed for the moment that there is no question of further corruption.) The only writers, therefore, whose evidence is worth examining are the poets. This evidence is as follows:²

Parmenides uses *χρῆν* once at the start of a line (*fr. 1. 11* Diels). Neither *χρῆν* nor *έχρην* is found in Homer, Hesiod, or the older elegiac and lyric poets with the exception of Pindar, who has *χρῆν* once (*fr. 108*) and *έχρην* once (*N. 7. 44*). It would be unfair, and indeed impossible, to attempt to conceal the axe I am attempting to grind; I may therefore say at once that an *έχρην* dating back at least to 461 B.C. (if not to 485) fills me with surprise and suspicion. I admit that the sense and metre of the lines² are beyond reproach; but is it not possible that what Pindar wrote was *ἀλλὰ τὸ μόριμον ἀπέδωχεν* *ένα χρῆν δέ τιν' κτλ.*? The postponement of *δέ* (not unknown in Pindar: cf. *O. 10. 99 παῖδες ἐρατὸν δέ*) would cause a false division of words, and *ἀπέδωχεν ἀχρῆν* would be emended by a scribe who felt no qualms about *έχρην* into the form in which we now read the line. (For the lengthening of the short open *α* before a mute and a liquid cf. *Ol. 3. 17 πιστὰ φρονέων*.)

Of the tragedians³ Aeschylus gives us three instances of *χρῆν* where the possibility of *έχρην* is ruled out by the metre (*Ag. 879 ὡς χρῆν*; *ib. 1658 ἀρκεῖν χρῆν*; *Ch. 930 οὐ χρῆν*), one of *έχρην* corrected by recent editors (*Ch. 907 ὁν δ' ἔχρην τοῦ δὲ χρῆν*), and one of *χρῆν* as an

¹ Where lexica exist I have used them; where not, I have searched the text. Neither the human eye nor human attention is infallible. I can only hope that omissions, if any, are few.

² *ἀλλὰ τὸ μόριμον ἀπέδωκεν* *έχρην δέ τιν' ἔνδον ἀλσεῖ παλαιτάτῳ*

Αἰακιδῶν κρέοντων τὸ λοιπὸν ἔμμεναι.

³ I cite from the texts respectively of Murray and Pearson. For Eur. *fragg.* I use Nauck.

¹ I am indebted to Mr. M. N. Tod for these facts.

emendation of *χρή* (*Ag.* 1419 *τῆσδε χρῆν*, Porson; MSS. *χρῆ*).

In Sophocles we find eight cases in which only *χρῆν* is metrically possible (*El.* 529 ἢ *χρῆν*; ¹ *ib.* 579 and 1505 (*ἐχρῆν contra metrum* A rec. Nicephorus ap. Walz i. 461), where *χρῆν* begins the line; *O.T.* 1184-5 *οὐ χρῆν* (*bis*); *Tr.* 1133 ὡς *χρῆν*; *Ph.* 430 and 1363, where *χρῆν* begins the line), one in which the form *ἐχρῆν* being possible the MSS. give it (*Ph.* 1062 ἦν σ' *ἐχρῆν* MSS., Ellendt ἦν σὲ *χρῆν*: see Jebb's note), and one where only *ἐχρῆν* is metrically possible. This latter occurs at *fr.* 107. 5-6 (Pearson) ('Αλέγης): *οὐ χρῆν τάδ' οὐτω δαίμονας θυητῶν πέρι | πράσσειν ἐχρῆν γάρ κτλ.* As to this 'Sophoclean' instance I cannot do better than to cite Pearson: 'The title is only quoted by Stobaeus (*Floril.*), and by him always as 'Αλέγης. A tragedy with the title 'Αλέγης is attributed to Lycophron by Suidas s.v.... Hense has recently revived a suggestion originally made by Bergk that the *Aletes* was a late play.'²

In the plays and fragments of Euripides there are forty-eight cases where the form *χρῆν* is guaranteed by the metre. These are: *Alc.* 379 ζῆν *χρῆν μ'* (n.b. LP μ' *ἐχρῆν contra metrum*); *ib.* 737 ἀπειπεῖν *χρῆν*; *ib.* 810 *οὐ χρῆν*; *Med.* 886 ἢ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 890 *οὔκουν χρῆν* (V *ἐχρῆν c. metrum*); *Heracl.* 449 *χρῆν χρῆν* (start of line); *ib.* 968 and 969 (start of lines); *Hipp.* 253 (start of line); *ib.* 459 ἀνέξη; *χρῆν*; *ib.* 507 *σοι, χρῆν*; *ib.* 619 γυναικῶν *χρῆν*; *ib.* 645 (start of line); *ib.* 925 φεῦ, *χρῆν*; *Andr.* 602 ἐρέσθαι *χρῆν*; *ib.* 607 ἦν *χρῆν*; *ib.* 650 ἦν *χρῆν*; *Hec.* 265 αἰτεῖν *χρῆν*; *ib.* 629-30 *ἔμοὶ χρῆν* (*bis*); *Supp.* 223 *οὔκουν χρῆν*; *ib.* 319 (start of line); *ib.* 539 ὁν *χρῆν*; *ib.* 1112 *οὐσίς χρῆν*; *H.F.* 211 ὁ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 224 ἦν *χρῆν*; *ib.* 709 ὁ *χρῆν*; *Ion* 842 νν *χρῆν*; *Tro.* 1025 ἦν *χρῆν*; *El.* 357 *πάλαι χρῆν*; *ib.* 973 *οὐ χρῆν*; *ib.* 1042 'Ορέστην *χρῆν*; *ib.* 1110 ἦ *χρῆν*; *I.T.* 1342 μὴ *χρῆν*; *Phoen.* 515 and 1602

¹ Where *ἐχρῆν* would be possible only by prodelision or crasis I regard *χρῆν* as metrically guaranteed.

² Cf. Hense on Stob. iv, p. 728, 1. It is not clear whether Bergk meant a late Sophoclean play or a post-Sophoclean play. In any case Wilamowitz definitely regards it as post-Sophoclean (*Heremes*, lxiv. 465).

(start of lines); *Or.* 500 (start of line); *ib.* 551 τί *χρῆν*; *ib.* 596 τί *χρῆν*; *Rh.* 270 οἱ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 396 πάλαι *χρῆν*; *fr.* 47. 1 and 2 νικᾶν *χρῆν* . . . οὐ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 388. 3 καὶ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 44. 2, 402. 2, 451. 2, and 1048. 2 (start of lines). To these may be added three cases where the editors accept *χρῆν* for *χρῆ* (*Alc.* 939 οὐ *χρῆν* Elmsley; *I.A.* 1196 ὃν *χρῆν* Reiske; *fr.* 99 τὸν εὐτυχοῦντα *χρῆν* Meineke—εὐτυχοῦντ' *ἐχρῆν* would destroy the caesura) and one where *χρῆν* is read conjecturally for ἄρα καὶ (*fr.* 653 εἰναι *χρῆν*).

I now take cases where Murray and Nauck accept *χρῆν* though *ἐχρῆν* would have stood metrically. Where some MS. or MSS. actually give *ἐχρῆν* I append an asterisk. These passages number seventeen and are as follows: *Med.* 573 τίθεσθε *χρῆν*; *Heracl.* 711 σοὶ δὲ *χρῆν* (*χρῆ* apogr. Paris); *Andr.* 423 δὲ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 1235* ἄκλαντα *χρῆν*; *Ion* 1375* με *χρῆν*; *Tro.* 655 ἀμὲ *χρῆν* (V *χρῆ*); *ib.* 1218* γάμουσι *χρῆν*; *El.* 1045 κτείνοντα *χρῆν*; *Hel.* 80* με *χρῆν*; *ib.* 612* με *χρῆν*; *Or.* 729* με *χρῆν*; *Ba.* 26* ἡκιστα *χρῆν*; *ib.* 1345* δὲ *χρῆν*; *I.A.* 487* ἡκιστα *χρῆν*; *Rh.* 643* σε *χρῆν*; *fr.* 172. 1* οὐτε *χρῆν*; *ib.* 495. 16 ἡκιστα *χρῆν* (a conjectural complement).

There are twenty-two cases in which Murray allows *ἐχρῆν* to appear in the Oxford text, though a slight emendation would have 'restored' *χρῆν*. These are: *Med.* 507 οὐν ἐχρῆν (leg. οὐχὶ *χρῆν*); *Heracl.* 649 σ' *ἐχρῆν*; *ib.* 1000 οὐκ ἐχρῆν μ' (leg. οὐχὶ *χρῆν μ' vel οὐ με χρῆν*); *Hipp.* 297 οὐκ ἐχρῆν σιγᾶν (where V has σε σιγᾶν); *ib.* 1072 σ' *ἐχρῆν* (leg. σε *χρῆν*); *ib.* 1323 σ' *ἐχρῆν* (where L actually reads σε *χρῆν*); *Andr.* 113 μ' *ἐχρῆν* (L με *χρῆν*); *ib.* 938 μ' *ἐχρῆν*; *Hec.* 231 μ' *ἐχρῆν*; *ib.* 416 μ' *ἐχρῆν*; *ib.* 1187 οὐκ ἐχρῆν; *ib.* 1224 παῖδες *ἐχρῆν*; *ib.* 1234 οἴς *ἐχρῆν* (leg. οἴσι *χρῆν*); *Supp.* 304 ἀδικουμένοις *ἐχρῆν* (leg. οἴσι *χρῆν*, Wecklein reads οἴσι σε *χρῆν*); *ib.* 512 οὐκ ἐχρῆν; *H.F.* 535 τόνδ' *ἐχρῆν*; *ib.* 1077 σ' *ἐχρῆν*; *Ion* 386 σ' *ἐχρῆν*; *ib.* 1317 ἡδικεῖτ', *ἐχρῆν* (leg. ἡδικεῖτο, *χρῆν*); *Hel.* 1651 δόμοις *ἐχρῆν* (leg. δόμοισι *χρῆν*); *Or.* 1030 ζῆν *ἐχρῆν σ'* (leg. ζῆν σε *χρῆν* Wecklein); *Ba.* 964 οἴς *ἐχρῆν* (οἴς σε *χρῆν* Fix).

We have now reviewed eighty-seven cases in Euripides¹ and fourteen in the

¹ I purposely omit Eur. *fr.* 1109. 2 (οὐκ *ἐχρῆν*)

other two tragedians, i.e. 101 cases in all, where it seems at least possible that *χρῆν* was originally written. We have now to examine twelve cases where, as the text now stands, *έχρῆν* is demanded by the metre. These are *Andr.* 395 τί δέ με καὶ τεκεῖν *έχρῆν*; *ib.* 1001 δείξεν γαμεῖν σφε μηδέν *ών* *έχρῆν* ἐμέ; *Supp.* 174 ἀσ αὐτὰς *έχρῆν*; *ib.* 266 τυχούσας οὐδέν *ών* αὐτὰς *έχρῆν*; *Ion* 1314 οὐχ ίζειν *έχρῆν*; *Tro.* 390 χεροῖν περισταλέντες *ών* *έχρῆν* *ύπο*; *ib.* 656 κείνω τε νίκην *ών* *έχρῆν* παριέναι; *ib.* 937 ἐξ *ών* *έχρῆν* με στέφανον ἐπὶ κάρα λαβεῖν; *El.* 1012 ἐσ οὐσ *έχρῆν*; *fr.* 736. 2 οὐδέν *ών* *έχρῆν* φίλου; *fr.* 449. 1 *έχρῆν* (start of line); *fr.* 1048. 6 τοῦτον τυραννέν τῶν κακιών *έχρῆν*.

Even of these twelve instances not all are above suspicion. In *Andr.* 1001 γαμεῖν μηδένα for γαμεῖν μηδένα *γάμον* is next door to impossible, and the general sense is bad, implying as it does that Orestes envisaged a string of possible marriages. Paley years ago suggested γαμεῖν σε μηδέν', ἦν, which gives the required sense. We might with equal probability write γαμεῖν σε μηδέν', ἦν με *χρῆν* γαμεῖν 'I will show that no one shall marry thee, my rightful bride'. At *Supp.* 266 αὐτὰς is prosy and σου is needed. Hence Nauck suggested *ών* *έχρῆν* σέθεν and Wecklein *ών* *χρήζουσί σου*. At *Tro.* 656 Barnes conjectured *ών* *⟨μ’⟩*. If this is right we can write the words *ών* *⟨με⟩* *χρῆν*. The presence of an undoubted *χρῆν* in the line before makes this highly probable. *Fr.* 449 is thus quoted by Sextus Empiricus. It is, however, also quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, Aristides, and the scholiast on Hermogenes, all of whom give *έδει* where Sextus has *έχρῆν*. Another case where *έδει* might have been expected instead of *έχρῆν* is *fr.* 736, for except in Homer (who only uses *δεῖ* once) *δεῖ* is usual and *χρῆν* unusual with genitives; see the distinction at *Ar. Av.* 1419 ἀλλ’ οὐτού δεῖ *χρῆν* λέγειν. There is no doubt

that in several places *χρῆν* ousted an original *δεῖ*. A good instance is *Eur. Or.* 667, where most of the MSS. give τί *χρῆν* φίλων; the correct *δεῖ* is found only in V (and suprascript in B), but it is reproduced by both Aristotle and Plutarch, who quote the line. I will say no more than that in six of the seven passages not commented upon *έδει* is metrically possible.

Thus we find in the tragedians 106 certain or at least likely instances of *χρῆν* to eight¹ of what look like undoubted cases of *έχρῆν*.

Applying the same system to the writers of old comedy² we find twenty-four instances where *χρῆν* is guaranteed by the metre. These are *Ar. Ach.* 540 οὐ *χρῆν*; *Eq.* 535 οὐ *χρῆν*; *Nub.* 371 καίτοι *χρῆν*; *ib.* 1359 εὐθὺς *χρῆν*; *Pax* 734 (start of line); *ib.* 1079 οὐπω *χρῆν*; *ib.* 1080 τί *χρῆν*; *Lys.* 526 καὶ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 680 τούτων *χρῆν*; *Thes.* 74 οὐ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 662 τρέχειν *χρῆν*; *ib.* 726 λαβεῖν *χρῆν*; *ib.* 777 ἐγχειρέιν *χρῆν*; *ib.* 793 οὐσ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 832 (start of line); *ib.* 842 η *χρῆν*; *Eccl.* 299 γὰρ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 548 οὐ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 581 δὴ *χρῆν*; *Plut.* 487 ηδὴ *χρῆν*; *ib.* 607 (start of line); Crates, *fr.* 14 χύτραν *χρῆν*; Hermippus, *fr.* 45 οἰκουρεῖν *χρῆν*; Eupolis, *fr.* 120 οὐ *χρῆν*.

Of cases where the editors accept *χρῆν* though *έχρῆν* could have stood metrically there are the following three: *Ar. Av.* 1434 ἄνδρα *χρῆν*; *Lys.* 591 ἡνίκα *χρῆν*; *Eccl.* 404 με *χρῆν* (the MSS. all give *χρῆν*; *χρῆν* is due to the Aldine edition).

Cases in which a slight correction would change *έχρῆν* to *χρῆν* number thirteen. They are: *Ar. Ach.* 562 αὐτ’ *έχρῆν*; *ib.* 691 μ’ *έχρῆν*; *Eq.* 11 οὐκ *έχρῆν*; *ib.* 848 σ’ *έχρῆν*; *Nub.* 1463 μ’ *έχρῆν*; *Vesp.* 1148 δῆτ’ *έχρῆν*; *Ar.* 58 ⟨σ’⟩ *έχρῆν* (Beck’s ⟨σ’⟩ is demanded by the metre); *Lys.* 54 δῆτ’ *έχρῆν*; *ib.* 357 τύπτοντ’ *έχρῆν*; *Ran.* 568 ἀλλ’ *έχρῆν*; *Plut.* 432 σ’ *έχρῆν*; *ib.* 624 σ’ *έχρῆν*; Pherecr. *fr.* 64 ἄνδρ’ *έχρῆν*.

This gives us forty cases in which we may reasonably conclude that *χρῆν* was used. To set against these are seventeen occurrences of *έχρῆν* which

¹ I say 8, not 7, as I have added Neophron, *fr.* 2. 7 (*πρὸς οὐν* *έχρῆν*).

² I cite from the Oxford text of Aristophanes, and from Kock, vol. i.

as almost certainly spurious (cf. hypoth. to *Rhesus*, p. 2, l. 11 (Murray) *πειλός πάνν* καὶ οὐ *πρέπων* *Εὐριπίδη*); also *fr.* 953. 1 ('not Euripidean': Wilmowitz in *Hermes*, xv, 491); also *fr.* *adesp.* III. 2 (ἀνθρώπους *έχρῆν*)—a fragment attributed to Eur. by Meineke (*Jahrb. f. Philol.* lxxxvii. 381), without, as it seems to me, any justification.

seem at first sight to stand their ground. With these we must deal separately. Ar. *Ach.* 540 ἐρεῖ τις, οὐ χρῆν· ἀλλὰ τί ἔχρην εἴπατε. This is paratragic in any case, and surely the same form should be used in each sentence. Van Leeuwen prints ἀλλὰ τί χρῆν (possible in tragedy, but not in comedy). Gomperz conjectured ὅτι δὲ χρῆν οὐκ εἴπατε. *Pax* 135 οὐκοῦν ἔχρην σε *Πηγάδου* ζεῦξι πτερόν, where nothing is overtly suspicious. Ib. 1041 ἀλλ' ἡκει ἔχρην. Here Blaydes, comparing *Plut.* 432, would read σ' ἔχρην or σε χρῆν. *Av.* 364 οὐ μέλλειν ἔχρην: *leg.* μέλλειν σε χρῆν; Ib. 1177 οὐκοῦν δῆτα περιπόλους ἔχρην πέμψαι; Here again the sense is if anything improved if we read σε χρῆν. The σε might easily have dropped out after the final s of περιπόλους. Similarly ib. 1201 the MSS. give λέγειν ἔχρην; Bergk suggested σ' ἔχρην and van Leeuwen prints σε χρῆν. At *Lys.* 574 πρῶτον μὲν ἔχρην forms the second *metron* of the anapaestic tetrameter. So far as the metre goes, this could equally well be πρῶτον μὲν χρῆν. *Thes.* 598 οὐν ἐλυτέειν ἔχρην seems blameless, as does *Ran.* 152 νῆ τούς θεούς ἔχρην γε πρὸς τούτους (though according to van Leeuwen there is confusion of lines here). Ib. 935 (*τραγωδίας* ἔχρην) was thought spurious by Hamaker, and van Leeuwen omits the line. At *Ecc.* 19 we read ἀλλ' οὐδεμία πάρεστιν ἀς ἡκειν ἔχρην which is dubious grammar. Blaydes reads ἀν; but there seems to be nothing amiss with ἔχρην. Ib. 535 most of the MSS. (followed by the Oxford text) give εἰτ' οὐ τὸ σαντῆς ἴμάτιον ἔχρην σ' ἔχειν; but Γ has σ' ἔχρην, whence van Leeuwen conjectures ἴμάτιον σε χρῆν. At *Plut.* 406

οὐκοῦν ἵατρὸν εἰσαγαγεῖν ἔχρην τινα Bergk suggested σ' ἔχρην, and ib. 586 καίτοι χρυσῷ μᾶλλον ἔχρην Elmsley conjectured, and van Leeuwen accepts, μᾶλλον χρῆν (anapaests). In Ar. *fr.* 2 ἀλλ' ἄννον οὐ μέλλειν ἔχρην we might well read μέλλειν σε χρῆν. I can make nothing of *fr.* 327 ἀμφόδοις ἔχρην αὐτῷ τεθεῖσθαι τοῦντα, a manifestly corrupt line. In *Plato fr.* 69, 5 τῇ παιδὶ τοὺς αὐλοὺς ἔχρην ἦδη προχείρους εἶναι (quoted by Athenaeus) ἔχρην seems sound. Thus of these seventeen cases only six are, on the face of it, above suspicion, which gives us fifty-one possible-probable instances of χρῆν to six of ἔχρην.

Looking back to the three questions with which this inquiry started we cannot, it must be admitted, give any very decisive answers. It seems fairly clear that both χρῆν and ἔχρην are found, so we cannot regard either form as absolutely incorrect. It is, however, also clear that the form ἔχρην is a later arrival than χρῆν—itself of no great antiquity. If we are correct in our statistics the first appearance of ἔχρην in tragedy would be circ. 425 B.C. (the date of the *Andromache* is not known for certain), in comedy 421 B.C. (Ar. *Pax*). We may, I think, safely say that the two elder tragic writers did not use ἔχρην and that Euripides used it sparingly. The writers of the Old Comedy (if we can take Aristophanes as typical) also seem to have preferred χρῆν, though they wrote at times ἔχρην, a form to which, if we can trust the figures given above, they had less objection than had Euripides.

M. PLATNAUER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

ATTIC 'H AND 'HN, 'I WAS'

MR. M. PLATNAUER'S welcome survey of χρῆν and ἔχρην in Attic drama¹ concludes, as concerns Euripides, with a judicious *non liquet*. For my own part, pending further evidence of ἔχρην by error for ἔδει,² I am for respecting the

testimony of the MSS. at *Andr.* 395, *Ion* 1314, and *Tro.* 390, where we cannot put χρῆν for ἔχρην without ado; and since *Andr.*, whatever its date, is not

¹ Above, p. 2. To his cases of χρῆν guaranteed by the metre (p. 4) add Soph. *fr.* 142. 13 P.; Eur. *Alc.* 633, 686, 709; *Rhes.* 752.

² p. 3: but Eur. *fr.* 736. 2 is not a good example, for μημονεύων οὐδὲν ἀν ἔχρην can mean

μημονεύων οὐδὲν τούτων ἀ ἔχρην μημονεύειν, and ἔδει has no advantage over ἔχρην. (By the way, φίλοι seems to be a mistake for φίλοι.) For χρῆν replacing δεῖ see Porson's note on *Or.* 667 (659), and add *Rhes.* 218, where the meaning seems to be 'good luck is all that you need' and δεῖ is preferred: but see *Alc.* 653.

one of the poet's later plays, I should gather that both forms were at his service during a good part of his career, if not throughout, and should abide by the MSS. even where we can get rid of $\epsilon\chi\rho\eta\eta$ by mere redvision of letters or by another change almost as slight.

This question has led me to work up some notes of mine on the similar question between η and $\eta\nu$ for 'I was'.¹

We have reason to think the simple vowel the older of the two forms in Attic. Solon has neither. Of the two relevant passages in Aeschylus, at *Ag.* 1637 the MSS. have η , and at *Cho.* 523 M is said to have had $\pi\alpha\rho\eta$ and now has $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota$. In Sophocles, η will serve in the fourteen instances, including *fr. 447 P.*, of the simple verb, and $\pi\alpha\rho\eta$ will serve in the only instance of a compound; that fragment has η , and the source of it attests η at *O.T.* 1123;² in *O.C.*, a play of his old age, L has η at 973, and at 1366 with ν added by a later hand; we may well, with recent editors, take it as a rule of thumb that Sophocles used the older form, and that form only, to the end. In Aristophanes,³ η will serve a dozen times, there is a good deal of evidence for η , and only in our latest play of his do we need $\eta\nu$ (*Plut.* 29, 695, 822). But with Euripides it is far otherwise; and finding no full and exact account of the evidence I will mention all the relevant instances that I know. They are all, as it happens, in trimeters, and all but two are of the simple verb.

If *Rhesus* is by Euripides, we have one good witness to his use of η , for at 63, where our medieval MSS. have $\eta\nu$ *πρόθυμος*, a scrap assigned to the fourth or the fifth century is cited for η .

If, as I hold, that play is not his, the best evidence for η in Euripides is at

¹ My paper was read to the Cambridge Philological Society on 16 Oct. 1941; see the *Cambridge University Reporter* of 11 Nov. Mr. J. Jackson's discussion of this question in the *Classical Quarterly* of October (xxxv, 170 f.) had not yet appeared, but I now refer to it in footnotes.

² But I cannot find authority for Pearson's note ' η rec' on *O.T.* 1389.

³ For further detail, as also for η in Plato, e.g. at *Rep.* 328 c, where Adam has $\eta\nu$ without a note, see W. G. Rutherford's *The New Phrynicus*, pp. 242 f.

Ion 638, where the MSS. give $\theta\epsilon\omega\nu\delta'$ $\epsilon\nu$ $\epsilon\nu\chi\alpha\iota\eta\gamma\omega\omega\nu\eta$ (not η) $\beta\rho\sigma\tau\omega\nu$: a verb, an imperfect, is missing, and, if it was η or $\eta\nu$, then η involves the smaller change.¹

At *Tro.* 474 also, if any change were needed, η would involve less change than $\eta\nu$: but the text is sound. Hecuba loquitur: $\eta\mu\eta\tau\omega\nu\kappa\alpha\tau\omega\nu\epsilon\gamma\eta\mu\mu\eta\eta\eta$. What is amiss with 'we were royalty' or 'I was royal', and what is gained by η $\mu\epsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu\eta\eta\eta$? For $\tau\omega\nu\eta\eta\eta$ used of the speaker only, compare $\tau\omega\nu\eta\eta\eta$ in Soph. *Ant.* 1057; and for other quick changes from plural to singular, both referring to the speaker only, see *Ion* 391, 595 ff., and *Hec.* 806 ff., a passage which shows also that we need no $\mu\epsilon\nu$ in *Tro.* 474.

At *Hec.* 13 and 15 our MSS. have $\eta\nu$. A scholium on 13 mentions the three forms $\eta\mu\eta\eta$, $\eta\nu$, and η , and is taken to have been written while η stood in the text; but that is by no means clear.³

Next, in twenty other lines the MSS. give $\eta\nu$, either form will serve, and recent editors favour the shorter form: *Alc.* 660; *Hipp.* 700; *Andr.* 59, 204; *Hec.* 284, 809; *Supp.* 639, 684, 1088; *H. F.* 232, 508; *Ion* 641, 781 ($\pi\alpha\rho\eta$); *I.T.* 957; *Hel.* 61, 931; *Or.* 1095 ($\pi\alpha\rho\eta$); *I.A.* 489, 1158; *fr. 285. 19 N.*

And now for the six⁴ lines wherein the MSS. give $\eta\nu$ and it cannot be replaced by η without more ado.

Except that a general suspicion hangs over *I.A.*, none of these six passages is justly suspect. At *Alc.* 655, $\pi\alpha\iota\eta\delta'$ $\eta\nu$

¹ The received conjecture $\eta\lambda\gamma\omega\omega\eta$ is dubious, and I suggest for consideration, though without confidence, $\eta\mu\eta\omega\omega\eta$: 'I consorted with leaders of men'. For a tribach formed by a word of the measure of $\eta\mu\eta\omega\omega\eta$ see (e.g.) *Hec.* 1240 or *Phoen.* 79. But a better remedy, perhaps including neither η nor any compound of η , may yet be found.

² These three passages were cited by A. Nauck in his *Euripideische Studien*, i. 2. For his discussion of $\eta\nu$ and η see ii. 67 and 141.

³ When $\eta\mu\eta\eta$ was familiar, even $\eta\nu$ was thought to need a note. See Murray's B at *Alc.* 655 and his M at *Hec.* 13 ($\eta\nu\alpha\tau\iota\tau\iota\tau\omega\eta\eta\eta$ $\eta\mu\eta\eta$ $\phi\eta\sigma\iota\eta\eta$). $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\eta\eta\eta$ and 15.

⁴ Who will may add *fr. 953. 34 N.*: but to me that passage is no more from Euripides than *Rhes.* Nauck's objection to $\delta\tau\eta\eta\eta$ $\epsilon\gamma\omega\pi\alpha\iota\eta\eta\eta$ is trivial, and his $\delta\zeta\omega\eta\eta\eta$ is out of tone.

ἐγώ σοι τῶνδε διάδοχος δόμαν, Nauck's objection to ἐγώ as unduly prominent, and his conjecture ἡ γεγώ,¹ have rightly found no acceptance; such an ἐγώ is not necessarily emphatic, nor is some emphasis here out of place: 'You had in me a son and heir'. At *Hipp.* 1012, where μάταος ἀρ' ἦν, οὐδαμοῦ μὲν οὖν φρενῶν might well be thought certain, all but one of the MSS. now cited have ἦν οὐδαμοῦ, and L's κούδαμοῦ² has no merit unless it be a merit to let us read ἡ. At *H.F.* 1416, ὡς ἐσ τὸ λῆμα παντὸς ἦν ἥσων ἀνήρ, Paley proposed κρείσσων (which admits ἡ) because Theseus 'as a hero, and especially as an Athenian hero', ought not to confess that he had been a coward even in hell: but an unheroic confession is just what the train of the dialogue needs; other conjectures aim only at getting rid of first-person ἦν.³ At *Ion* 280, βρέφος νεογνὸν μητρὸς ἦν ἐν ἀγκάλαις, there is nothing to be said for Nauck's οὐδόν unless the ἦν be a fault.⁴ *Hel.* 992, ἐλευθὸς ἦν ἄν μᾶλλον ἡ δραστήριος, is as faultless, and not so easy work for the faultfinder.⁵ At *I.A.* 944 Nauck's ἔγωγ' ἄν ἡ κάκιστος for the ἔγώ κάκιστος ἦν ἄρ' of the MSS. foists on

¹ 'Disconcerting' to Jackson; neat, no doubt, if ἦν were wrong.

² The κ is clear in J. A. Spranger's photograph, on which see *C.R.* xlii (1935), 213.—Wecklein tells us that ἄρα is 'for the metre's sake' instead of ἄρα (as if the poet could not have written ἦν ἄρα).—Jackson says that, given those seven words, the poet's first impulse 'must have been' to write ἀρ' ἡ μάταος; οὐδαμοῦ μὲν οὖν φρενῶν. 'Must we not question me no question.'

³ Such are ἡμεν ἥσωνες, and Jackson's σπάνους ἦν ἥσων ἀνήρ, 'a worse man was scarce'.

⁴ The syntactical connexion which it gives is superfluous in stichomythia.—Jackson's ἐν ἀγκάλαις νεογνὸν ἡ μητρὸς βρέφος spoils the order of the words.

⁵ Wecklein's case against this line and its neighbours is coloured by his mistrust of the ἦν. Jackson regards the passage, apart from 992, as 'either Euripides or an imitation perfect to the last detail'. As for 992, he finds in Pearson's note 'a pure fallacy' but does not tell us what. Scaliger's trouble may have been due to the absence of the ἄν from some MSS. and editions: but the ἄν is clear in L and is cited from P, and what is wrong with 'If I were taking to tears (as I am not) I should be an object of pity (as I am not) instead of a man of action (as I am)'? That is good enough for the Menelaus of this light-hearted play.

the line an unwanted γε and robs it of a wanted ἄρα.¹

That Attic should have forgone the distinction between ἡ for the first person and ἦν for the third is strange; but languages do sometimes 'cut off their noses to spite their faces'. English, for example, has almost lost the useful words *hither* and *thither*, forgoing the distinction between *hither* and *here*, *thither* and *there*. That Attic did sooner or later use ἦν of the first person is certain; the only question is how soon.

It would be nice to know that the distinction was still clean-cut in 408 B.C., for without it there was risk in *Or.* 377, worse even than in the γαλῆν' ὄρῶ of 279. Menelaus asks after Orestes and adds:

βρέφος γάρ ἦν τότε ἐν Κλυταμίστρας χεροῖν
οἵτε ἔξελεινος μέλαθρον ἐς Τροίαν ἤν.

The wilful misinterpretation 'I was a child in arms' (sit *venia ambiguitati*) 'when I left home for Troy' would have arraigned Aristophanes.

But it does look as if Euripides used ἦν of the first person both early and late, for *Alc.* was acted in 438 B.C., *Hipp.* in 428, *Hel.* in 412, and *I.A.* is doubtless our latest play of his.

Did he ever so use ἡ? Apart from *crasis* or *synizesis* or *prodelision*, metre can never decide in favour of ἡ. If μέσω πόρω, the simple dative, were demonstrably wrong for 'in mid passage', then we should need ἡ 'ν μέσω πόρω, Cobet's conjecture, at *Soph. Trach.* 564: but a clear instance of *prodelision* after such an ἡ is in all our tragedies not to be found.²

Likely enough Euripides used both ἡ and ἦν throughout his career; ἡ before consonants, ἦν before vowels.³ But that

¹ Without ἄρα the imperfect would be strange.—Jackson dwells on the suspicions attaching to *I.A.*, and to this passage in particular, and decides that 'the passage is not evidence for the form—the form is evidence against the passage' (not until the form has passed from the dock to the dungeon).

² After ἡ in general it is not at all rare.

³ For differences between one tragic poet and the others in such a matter compare ἡμν and ὑμν, in which Sophocles preferred ὑ.—No clear light is thrown on ἦ-ν by the Attic usage of other words in which a long vowel can have after it a 'mobile' consonant: οὐ, οὐτω, and pluperfects in -ει. They

is guesswork, not evidence. On the evidence my verdict is: Whether he ever used η of the first person, *non liquet*; but *liquet* that he so used $\eta\nu$.

E. HARRISON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

point to simple η before a consonant if no pause intervenes; but ω and $\omega\nu$ before a pause point different ways. These words deserve further study from the present point of view. In *Hipp.*, *Hec.*, *I.T.*, only at *Hec.* 296 and 785 do I find evidence for $\omega\nu$ before a consonant with no intervening pause. There is certainly in all our tragedies no trace of prodelision after $\omega\nu$ (any more than after ω); and at *Ar. Lys.* 816, where recent texts give $\omega\nu\omega$ $\kappa\epsilon\nu\omega$, perhaps $\kappa\epsilon\nu\omega$ should be read, though the context has no other un-Attic feature, and elsewhere in *Ar.* that word and its kin have ϵ except in un-Attic speech.—Applying such

analogies as best I can, I see nothing against the rule of thumb that Sophocles used η but not $\eta\nu$. To the two instances of the shorter form in Aeschylus a third would be added by Tucker's η for $\eta\nu$ at *Supp.* 344, a conjecture acclaimed as quite certain by Housman in *C.R.* iv (1906), 106: but, if the first person of the verb is right, conceivably $\eta\nu$ may be right after all.—Jackson wonders why, if $\eta\nu$ $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ is right in our oldest play of *E.*, 'that useful cretic' should not appear in 'three myriads' of later lines. Well, how often does the equally 'useful' cretic $\epsilon\mu$ $\epsilon\gamma\omega$ occur? In *A.* it seems to occur only twice, and in *S.* only thrice, though $\epsilon\mu$ is in *A.* and *S.* thrice as common as η . It is not before $\epsilon\gamma\omega$, usually superfluous, but before other words, that this $\eta\nu$ would mostly be used by a poet who used it at all. Even if it could be shown to be relatively rare in *E.*, we need not be disconcerted, any more than by his one $\omega\delta\omega$ or $\omega\delta\theta\omega$, in *Alc.* 780, against a score of $\omega\delta\theta\omega$, or by the $\eta\delta\omega$ of *Ion* 1187. Poets do not strictly ration themselves in the use of alternative forms.

THEOCRITEA

1. 21, 22. δεῦρ' ὑπὸ τὰν πτελέαν ἑσδώμεθα τῷ τε
Πρήπω
καὶ τὰν κρανίδων κατεναντίον.

So Wilamowitz without any critical note. There seem to me to be two objections to *κρανίδων*. First, if *κρηνίς* (diminutive of *κρήνη*) means, as it should, a spring of water, or even if here it means, as it apparently can, a flowing stream, both the plural and the preposition *κατεναντίον* are strange. Secondly, as *Πρήπω* means *statue* of Priapus, the expression 'opposite <the statue of> P. and the springs' gives an odd zeugma. What we expect rather is some word meaning <statues of> *spring nymphs*.¹ This is supplied by Hiller, Cholmeley, and Legrand in the form *Κραναῦ*, a reading unknown to the MSS., which give (besides *κρανίδων* (KPSAETr¹)) the *vox nihil* *κρανιᾶδῶν* (H) and *κρανιάδῶν* (Tr²X). This latter form appears in the *editio princeps* (Med.) and the two early sixteenth-century editions (Juntine and Callierges) and indeed, as far as I know, in all editions up to and including that of Ahrens. The word *Κρηνίάς* (*spring-nymph*) is in itself a likely form and receives some support from the *κρηνάων* of Aesch. *fr.* 168, though it must

be admitted that in the letter (34. 2) of Diogenes whence it derives the MS. gives *κρηναῖσιν*—*κρηνιάσιν* being an emendation of Meineke's.

Why then *κρανιᾶδῶν*? Legrand in his apparatus says 'Ahrens ex schol.'. This is misleading. It is true that the word *κρηνιάδας* appears in some scholia, but the scholiast of K (perhaps the most reliable) gives, and Wendel in his edition of the scholia prints, *κρανιᾶδῶν* ἀντὶ τοῦ *κρηνῶν*, ἐκτὸς εἰ μή ποι τὰς Νύμφας οὔτω καλεῖ, which in Ahrens appears as εἰ μή ποι τὰς N. *Κρηνιάδας* εἴτε. It seems likely therefore that the old reading *Κρανιάδῶν* should in future editions be reinstated.

1. 56. αἰπολικόν [τι] θάμα.

Doubtless *θάμα* is the right reading, but it is a pity that Legrand blindly follows Wilamowitz in citing *A.P.* 9. 101 in support. In Stadt Müller's apparatus there is no trace of *θάμα*; the reading is *μήνυμα*. It is true that Alpheus has *αἰπολικόν* and might reasonably be cited in support of the adjective here—not of the substantive.

2. 59–62. Θεοτυλὶ νῦν δὲ λαβοῖσα τὸ τὰ θρόνα ταῦθ' ὑπόμαξον

καὶ λέγ' ἐπιφθόζοισα· τὰ Δέλφιδος ὄστια πάσσων·

¹ For the conjunction of P. and the Nymphs cf. *Mosc.* 3. 27–9; and see Wilamowitz, *Reden und Vorträge*, i, p. 268.

I am not here concerned with the generally excised l. 61 or the corrupt l. 60, but simply with the words *ὑπόμαξον* and *πάσσων*, both of which are found in all the MSS., and the former of which is commented upon in the scholia.

Sympathetic magic demands that the action really performed and that performed in intention should be expressed by the same verb (cf. l. 21 *πάσσοντα* καὶ λέγε ταῦτα 'τὰ Δέλφιδος ὅστια πάσσων'. All editors, therefore, except (inexplicably) Wilamowitz, emend, and all accept Ahlwardt's *μάσσων*. It is true, as Fritzsche suggests, that *πάσσων* might be an echo from *πάσσων* of l. 21 or even from *θρόνα ποικίλης πάσσων* of *Il.* 22. 441. But is *μάσσων* a suitable word? It would perhaps be unfair to press the point that *ὑπομάσσων* scarcely occurs elsewhere while *ὑποπάσσων* is well attested; but it is not unfair to urge that 'knead' is not the right verb for *θρόνα* or for *ὅστια*. Fritzsche is alive to this and notes: '[*θρόνα*] non *flores* dicit . . . sed potius *suco* *coctarum* *herbarum* *magicarum*'. To this supposed use of *θρόνα* there is, as far as I know, no parallel; though F. remarks 'eadem vis vocabulo subicitur a Nicandro, *Ther.* 936'. A reference to this line does not bear out F.'s contention; and indeed the scholium on it runs: *θρόνα, τοντέστι φάρμακα, ἥγουν τὰς βοράβας* (*herbs*). Of the two corrections it looks as though *ὑπόμαξον* should be chosen; but *ὑπόπασσων* is unmetered. May not Theocritus have written *ὑπόπασσων*?

In defence of this bold, perhaps rash, suggestion I quote, with his permission, some words of Professor G. E. K. Brauholtz.

'What is the true root of the verb *πάσσων* (Att. *πάττων*)? If there is only one root, *πατ-*, then the Attic form *-ττ-* can only be explained, like all other Attic presents in *-ττ-* from roots ending in *τ* (e.g. *έρεττων*), as due to analogical influence of roots in *κ*, e.g. *φυλάττω* (*φυλακ-*). But Boisacq (s.v. *πάσσων*) at least considers the possibility of

a second root ending in a guttural, which may have existed side by side with the other and produced a mixed conjugation. Further, in most Doric dialects roots ending in *δ* form their future and *σ*-aorist on the pattern of roots in *γ*—analogy is the only explanation, starting in the present in *-ζω*. Now we know that at any rate in one Doric dialect in *Magna Graecia* (*Tarentum*) *-ζω* presents have become *-σσων* (cf. Bechtel, *Griech. Dial.*, vol. ii, p. 405, § 51), probably through confusion in the *σ*-aorist with roots ending in *κ*. A dialect which has *φρίσσων* (*φρικ-*) *φρίξαι*, *σαλπίσσων* (*σαλπιγγ-*) *σαλπίξαι*, *λακτίσσων* (*λακτ-ιδ-*) *λακτίξαι*, might also have *πάσσων* (even if from *πατ-*) *πάξαι*; the analogical influence of *μάσσων* (*μακ-*) *μάξαι* and the like would be particularly strong in this case. Parallels can be quoted from noun stems in *τ* and *θ* in Doric, where we have nominative in *-ξ* (e.g. *κέληξ*, Att. *κέλης*; *όρηξ*, Att. *όρης*) owing to the analogical influence of guttural stems.'

30. 20. 21. οὐδέν αὐτῷ γλυκερᾶς ἄνθεμον ἄβας πεδίον μαλίκων μένει.

Fritzsche explains: 'ne illi quidem flos iuventae perpetuo manet.' Whether he merely ignores *πεδίον μαλίκων* or translates it by 'perpetuo' I do not know. Legrand gives: 'et il ne garde pas, avec ses compagnons d'âge, la fleur d'aimable jeunesse'; with the footnote: 'ses compagnons d'âge le suivent dans la vie, mais non pas la fleur de la jeunesse (?). Neither of these is very satisfactory. Wilamowitz suggests *τὸ δ'*¹, followed (rather inexplicably) by *αὐτε*. May not Theocritus have written *τὸ δ'* *αὐτῷ* (or even *αὐτῷ*); i.e. 'and the flower of his youth remains with (i.e. prefers) contemporaries'? Neither the *δέ* of 19 nor that of 20 is antithetic to the *μέν* of 18, which is answered by the *δέ* of 21. Thus ll. 18–20 give three reasons from the point of view of the *έρωμενος* against pederasty, viz. his (?) virility, his fickleness, and his natural preference for companions of his own age.

M. PLATNAUER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

¹ The Antinoe papyrus reads *τῶ δ'*.

THE TWENTY-SECOND IDYLL OF THEOCRITUS¹

HERE and there from the literature which deals with Theocritus the student may gather a vague impression that his twenty-second Idyll, the *Hymn to the Dioscuri*, is not a very satisfactory poem,² but to judge from their meagre and desultory commentaries scholars have not found it very interesting, and nobody, so far as I know, has envisaged at all plainly the problem which it presents. The purpose of this paper is to state the problem, and in order to do so it will be necessary to consider separately the four component parts into which the Idyll falls.

Part 1. *Prelude to the Dioscuri* (1-26)

This is, and was no doubt recognized as, a version in the Alexandrian idiom of the 33rd Homeric Hymn.³ Both poems present the Dioscuri as guardians of those in peril at sea. T., addressing the more sophisticated audience, suppresses the theophany of the Dioscuri and substitutes a more elaborate picture of the scene—tempestuous night-fall: the ship, with bulwarks breached and tackle in disarray, at the mercy of a confused sea: then, by divine intervention, calm with stars showing more and more clearly through the parting cloud-rack. The performance is slight but highly accomplished, and the seascape is a worthy counterpart to the landscape vignettes in which T. excels.

T. decides to celebrate the exploits of Polydeukes before those of Kastor.

Part 2. *Polydeukes and Amykos* (27-134)

The Argo has put in at the country of the Bebrykes. The Dioscuri, wandering off alone, find a spring and by it

¹ The substance of this paper was read to the Cambridge Philological Society on 20 Nov. 1941. I am, as usual, indebted to my friend Professor J. D. Beazley for some assistance in archaeological matters.

² e.g. Legrand, *Étude*, 90, *Buc. Gr.* 1. 179; Bignone, *Teocrito*, 320; Pohlenz, *Gött. Anz.* 1935, 397. Wilamowitz's study (*Textgeschichte*, 182) hardly considers the poem as a whole.

³ The Hymn is dated by Wilamowitz (*Textg.* 184) in the sixth century, but it may be earlier; see Allen, Halliday, and Sikes, *H. Hymns*, p. 436.

Amykos, who refuses them leave to drink. They must box with him, and the vanquished will be the victor's slave. Argonauts and Bebrykes assemble: Polydeukes knocks Amykos out in the second bout and makes him swear to be more hospitable in future.

In general handling this scene reminds one at once of the *Rape of Hylas* in *Id.* 13, and both subjects have also this in common that they are treated by Apollonius in the *Argonautica*. In *Id.* 13 the general resemblance, which is reinforced by verbal similarities and coincidences of detail, makes it certain that that poem and the Hylas episode in *Ap. Rh.* 1. 1207-72 are not independent of one another, and I have given elsewhere¹ my reasons for thinking it hardly less certain that T.'s poem is the later of the two, and that he is deliberately setting out to improve upon A. I do not myself doubt that the same is true of the Amykos section in this poem, though I admit that its connexion with *Ap. Rh.* 2. 1-97 is somewhat less obvious than that between the two versions of the Hylas story, and it would be possible to assign their resemblances to coincidence.² Possible, but not easy: for in spite of many differences of detail the general conception and handling of the boxing-match in two bouts are markedly similar in the two places. This general similarity is reinforced by similarities of vocabulary and phrasing which, though less numerous and cogent than in the parallel Hylas narratives, are by no means negligible,³ and as some of

¹ *C.Q.* xxxii. 10.

² The connexion is assumed by Schwartz (*Charakterköpfe*, 2. 63) and von Blumenthal (*RE*, 5A. 2014); denied by Wilamowitz in an *obiter dictum* (*Textg.* 194). I know of no discussion of the question.

³ See T. 44, A. 2. 4: T. 54, A. 22: T. 65, A. 14: T. 85, A. 72 (*ἰδπεῖν* is a rare word): T. 94, A. 38: T. 104, A. 108: T. 126, A. 83. In *Id.* 13 there are similarities to parts of the *Argonautica* not concerned with Hylas, and here, considering how rarely fire-drills are mentioned in antiquity, I think it improbable that T. 33 *εὐδίς τ' ἐρόπωντο πυρεῖα τοιούτων* is unconnected with A.'s similar landing-scene in the Hylas episode (1. 1184).

them are quite unconnected with the common subject-matter, those who would ascribe them to chance must explain why there are none in the remainder of the Idyll.¹ Moreover, if in one of the two stories common to the poets a connexion between them is established, there is some *a priori* likelihood of a connexion also in the second, and it should be remembered that Hylas and Amykos are in A. the subject of consecutive episodes separated only by the account of the voyage from the scene of one to that of the other.

If the connexion between the two passages be admitted, then it is plain, as in the Hylas story, that a poet of A.'s calibre would not have written as he did with T.'s much superior narrative before him; either he would have written better, or, if he could not, he would have taken pains not to challenge comparison. Therefore T. must have written second. In A. the Argonauts land at sunrise (1. 1359). Amykos with the Bebrykes comes down to the shore and tells them they cannot depart until their best boxer has fought with him; whereon Polydeukes loses his temper and the match is made. There is no setting, no atmosphere, nothing to prevent the Argonauts (who also have lost their tempers) from attacking the Bebrykes at once, nothing but the king's threat to prevent them, if so minded, from putting to sea again. In T. the incident is much more artistically staged, and scene and characters

... στόρνυθαι τοὶ δ' ἀμφὶ πυρήνα δινεύεσκον), for Id. 13 proves him to have at some time studied that episode closely. The connexion was noticed by Casaubon (*Lect. Theoc.* ch. 20). T. 116 f. (with Call. H. 3. 186) may well be connected also with A. 1. 22, though perhaps I should add that I subscribe neither to Gercke's interpretation of A. nor to his theory of the relationship between the passages (*Rh. Mus.* 42. 598). See also T. 27 f., A. 1. 2 f., 2. 321. I mention in passing, though not as necessarily evidential here, that T.'s puzzling (apparently progressive) γάρ δὴ in 115, which commentators disdain to notice, occurs in precisely similar contexts at A. 2. 851, 1090, 4. 450.

¹ At least I have noticed none unless ἱκον, *said*, (167) should be so regarded. This is Apollonian (1. 834, 2. 240, *al.*), but it is derived, and may be derived independently, from *Od.* 19. 203, 22. 31. It is used also by Lycophron (574).

are sketched with great skill—a green and flowery glade open to the sun in the middle of the forest; a crystal spring¹ at the foot of a rock and the solitary seated figure of the spring's monstrous warden: Polydeukes, friendly and courteous, forced to fight against his will with a boorish and uncouth opponent; and presently showing that the skilled athlete is more than a match for mere brawn and brute strength. The piece as a whole is less attractive than *Id.* 13, but that is because to a modern reader of poetry the Rape of Hylas is a more congenial theme than a sanguinary prize-fight, and this preference ought not to blind us to the fact that, whatever its relation to Apollonius, Part 2 contains some of T.'s best work.²

¹ This spring is not T.'s invention, for, as Wilamowitz remarked, it is included in the representation of the scene on the Ficoroni cista (*Wien. Vorleg.* 1889, T. 12), which is itself of late fourth-century date, though the picture no doubt goes back to an earlier model.

² As in the Hylas story, T. and A. differ in some points as to the legend, though their differences are not now very illuminating. In the Amykos story the chief variations are that A. places the episode before, T. after, the passage of the Symplegades, and that in A. Amykos is killed outright in the boxing-match whereas in T. he is spared to lead a better life. The first difference may reflect an antiquarian dispute as to the home of the Bebrykes, who were extinct before the time of Eratosthenes (Pliny, *N.H.* 5. 127). A. agrees with Strabo, who places them in the neighbourhood of Cyzicus and Abydos (13. 586), and his subsequent narrative (135 ff.) is designed to account for their disappearance. They were reputed to be of Thracian origin (Strab. 7. 295, 12. 541, *al.*), and I think that T.'s epithet *δέι κορώντες* (77), which has puzzled some commentators, is a learned allusion to the fact; for when Aischines at 14. 46 says Kyniska has not been near him for two months οὐδὲ εἰ Θρακοὶ κέκαρπαι οὐδε, he is referring to his unbarbered head, on which his friend has commented at 4. That is to say that T., perhaps remembering the Θρήκες ἀκρόκομος of Il. 4. 533 and the Αἴθαρες ὅπιθεν κορώντες of Il. 2. 542 (to whom Aristotle ascribed a Thracian origin), thought the Thracians wore their hair long, though according to his scholars he was wrong.

As to the conclusion of the fight, mythographers (Apollod. 1. 119, Hygin. 17) agree with A. or follow him, but Σ Ap. Rh. 2. 98 assert that in Epicharmus and Pisander ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Πολυδένης, and where in works of art the end of the fight is shown Amykos is always tied up (*Wien. Vorleg.* 1889, T. 12; Trendall, *Frühital. Vas.* T. 5; Gerhard, *Etr. Spieg.* 5. 91; Matthies, *Praen. Spieg.*, p. 79; *Vendita Sarti*, T. 12; Körte, *Urne Etr.* 2. 35;

Part 3. *Kastor and Lynkeus* (137-211)

With two rather bleak lines of transition (135 f.) T. turns to the other twin. The Dioscuri, having carried off the daughters of Leukippos, are in their chariots in full flight but hotly pursued by the sons of Aphareus, Lynkeus and Idas, who overtake them near the tomb of Aphareus. All four leap from their chariots ready for the fray, but Lynkeus tries first the effect of persuasion. 'Why', says he, 'must you fight? These girls were solemnly affianced to us by their father, whom you have seen fit to bribe. I have frequently told you before that this is no way for heroes to behave. There are plenty of desirable young women in the Peloponnesus and you are eligible bachelors who can take your choice. Leave us our brides and we will help you to find others. I know you wouldn't listen when I suggested this before, but there is still time; and remember we are cousins.' What reply Kastor has to make to this very reasonable protest we do not know, for there is a gap in the text.¹ He can hardly

deny the facts alleged but must adduce other considerations. He is discovered when the lacuna ends suggesting that, if there is to be a fight, one pair, Polydeukes and Idas, shall stand out and leave it to their younger brothers. This proposition is not discussed; but Kastor and Lynkeus fall to while the others look on. After some fruitless tilting with spears they draw swords, Kastor severs the fingers of Lynkeus' sword-hand and kills him from behind when he has turned to flight. Idas tears up his father's tombstone intending to throw it at Kastor, but is blasted by a thunderbolt.

At this point it will be well to look at other accounts of the quarrel between the Dioscuri and the Apharidae.² In Pindar (*N.* 10. 60 ff.) Idas, *ἀμφὶ βουσὶν πως χολωθεῖς*, mortally wounded Kastor. Polydeukes came up, and Idas and Lynkeus threw their father's tombstone at him. Polydeukes, however, killed Lynkeus, and Zeus settled Idas with a thunderbolt. It is implied by Pindar's scholia (on 114) that he is following the *Cypria*, and Proclus' summary of the *Cypria*³ enables us to amplify and to understand Pindar's reticence as to the origin of the quarrel. It was owing to the fact that the Dioscuri had stolen the cattle of the Apharidae. Why they had stolen them is explained by a scholiast on Lycophron.⁴ The Apharidae had taunted the Dioscuri with paying no bride-price for their brides, the Leukippides; whereupon the Dioscuri had carried off the cattle of Aphareus and given them to Leukippos. Whether that is precisely the story alluded to by Lycophron,⁴ and how precisely that

Furtwaengler, *Ant. Gemm.* 61. 22). T.'s conclusion is generally assumed to be his own invention. I remark, however, that as the monuments cannot, and *Σ* Ap. Rh. do not, tell us what happened to Amykos after he was bound, the binding may have been a preliminary, omitted by T., to imposing the oath. According to the note already cited Deiochus *ἐν α' περι Κυνίκων καταπυκτενθῆναι φίων αὐτὸν*, and he too may have ended the story as T. does, though, if so, he cannot be proved to have done so before T.

One more antiquarian point. If, as seems probable, T.'s *σπεῖραι* and *ἰμάρτες* (80 f.) differ from each other, T. anachronistically arms his boxers with the later fortified form of *ἰμάρτες*—the *σφαῖραι* of Plat. *Legg.* 830 B or the *ἰμάρτες ὀδύνες* of Paus. 8. 40. 3, Philostr. *Gymn.* 10, if indeed these are not the same. A. (52) gives them the plain *ἰμάρτες* worn already at *Il.* 23. 684 and, presumably in the note that Amykos invented them (Clem. Al. *Strom.* 363 P; *Σ* Plat. *Legg.* 830 B), makes Amykos provide both pairs and boast their merits. Amykos offers Polydeukes his choice and the latter disdains to choose—a good touch, which T. if he was following A. may well have felt tempted to borrow.

¹ Wilamowitz's arguments (*Textg.* 191) seem to me in the main untouched by the criticisms of Körnecke (*Philol.* 72. 379) and Bignone (*Teocrito*, 321). If the words *δυοιν ἀντιφέρεσθαι*, cited from T. at *E.M.* 290. 53, are really his, the missing lines may well have supplied their context.

² So I shall call them, for their father's name is commonly *Ἀφαρέύς*. The patronymic occurs only in the forms *Ἀφαρητίδαι* (Pind. *N.* 10. 65) and *Ἀφαρητίδαι* (Ap. Rh. 1. 131), but *Ἀφάρης* is found only at Pseudo-Plut. *Mor.* 315 E.

³ *Homeric Hymns*, ed. T. W. Allen, p. 103.

⁴ 547 (p. 194 Scheer).

⁴ What he says is (546) *αθῆς δ' ἐναχμαύονται* *αντανέψιοι, | εὐεψιές ὄρνισι χραυσμῆσαι γάμους | βιασοκλάσας, ἀρπαγάς τε συγγόναν | χρῆζορτες, ἀλφῆς τῆς δεδνάτου δίκυρ—καὶ ἔστι ληρώδης ὁ λόγος προφανός καὶ ληρώδως λέγει* observes the scholiast, and though his reason is insufficient his impatience is intelligible.

despicable writer follows the *Cypria*, it is fortunately not necessary to inquire.¹ It is, however, fairly clear that the Leukippides appeared in the *Cypria* in this connexion though not as affiance to the Apharidae.² There is, however, another story in which they do not appear, though cattle are again the cause of the dispute.³ Apollodorus (3. II. 2), after telling us that the Dioscuri had carried off, married, and had children by, the Leukippides, proceeds to narrate their quarrel with the Apharidae. The four had, it seems, been raiding cattle in Arcadia. Idas, called on to divide the spoils, cut a cow into four parts and said that he who first ate his share should have half the plunder and that the other half should go to the man who finished second. After which he wolfed not only his own but his brother's quarter and, accompanied by Lynkeus, retired to Messene with the whole herd. Dissatisfied with this settlement the Dioscuri raided Messenia; Idas killed Kastor, Polydeukes was wounded but killed Lynkeus, and Zeus disposed of Idas.⁴

It will be observed that so far no version makes the Leukippides brides of the Apharidae; and T. is in fact the first to tell the story so. That relationship appears again in Ovid (F. 5. 693 ff.) and Hyginus (80), whose stories, since their dénouements differ from T.'s, can-

not be entirely derived from him,¹ and it is perhaps unlikely that this variation was T.'s invention.² There is, however, no evidence either literary or monumental to show that it was not.³ There is a similar lack of evidence about a feature of T.'s story much more important to his purpose than the Leukippides—that Kastor kills Lynkeus. Only Ovid and Hyginus match him with Lynkeus at all, and only the latter leaves him victorious. In Ovid he is killed by Lynkeus; in the *Cypria*, and in the story told by Apollodorus, he fights with, and is killed by, Idas.⁴

It would seem, therefore, that different accounts were given of the quarrel which T. takes for his theme, that not all of them connected it with the Leukippides, and that of those which did

¹ In Ovid Lynkeus kills Kastor, Polydeukes Lynkeus, and Zeus Idas; in Hyginus Kastor kills Lynkeus, Idas Kastor, and Polydeukes Idas. The betrothal to the Apharidae appears also in Σ Pind. N. 10. 112. At Σ Lyc. 538, perhaps by a confusion, the girls are betrothed to the Dioscuri and abducted by the Apharidae.

² The same doubt arises over the version of the Daphnis legend used in *Id.* 1, and in both cases the allusive way in which the story is handled suggests that T. expected at any rate the more learned of his audience to know what he was talking about.

³ There would be monumental evidence if Benndorf's interpretation of a relief of about 400 B.C. from the Heroon at Gyeulbashi were secure (Benndorf, *Heroon v. Gjölbashi-Trys*, 159, T. 16). There the scene of the abduction is a building—house or temple—in front of which elaborate preparations for a feast are in progress. Among those pursuing the Dioscuri are two men on horseback whom Benndorf took for the Apharidae. The feast, he thought, was the marriage feast of the Apharidae and Leukippides, which is given as the occasion of the abduction by Σ Pind. *Nem.* 10. 112. This interpretation, however, in any case uncertain, has been criticized by Körte (*Jahrb.* 31. 265), who takes the horsemen to be merely members of the posse turning out to help. It may be mentioned that the Apharidae nowhere appear on vases which represent the rape of the Leukippides.

I remark that T. can hardly envisage the girls as abducted from the wedding, for though that situation would square well with his γαμβροὶ μελογάμοι (140) it is hardly compatible with 149 ff.

⁴ Lycophron probably meant his readers to interpret according to the *Cypria*: what he says may be found by the curious at 550 ff. It is true that Kastor came to life again, but the credit for this belongs to his brother, who shared his own immortality between the two.

¹ See Wentzler, 'Επικλήσεις, 5. 18; Holzinger on Lyc. 546; Wilamowitz, *Textg.* 188; Robert, *Gr. Heldenage*, 314; *RE*, 5. 1113; Roscher, 2. 2208. I have not seen Wentzler in *Epithal. f. W. Passow*, to which Wilamowitz refers.

² Whatever part the Leukippides played in the *Cypria*, their abduction was a common theme of artists long before the third century. To say nothing of vases, it appeared in the temple of Athena Chalkioikos at Sparta (Paus. 3. 17. 3) and on the throne at Amyclae (ib. 18. 11), and appears in the frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi (Poulsen, *Delphi*, 113).

³ Paus. 4. 3. 1 speaks of a μάχη περὶ τῶν βοῶν but does not mention the circumstances.

⁴ There is possibly an earlier trace of this story in a sixth-century metope from the 'Sicyonian Treasury' at Delphi where the Dioscuri and Apharidae are seen driving cattle (B.C.H. 20. 662, pl. 11; *Fouilles de Delphes*, 4. 4; Poulsen, *Delphi*, 86; de la Coste-Messelière, *Au Musée de Delphes*, 96, 199 and, on the building, 41).

so not all represented the Leukippides as affianced to the Aphaidae; also that Kastor is usually pitted not with Lynkeus but with Idas, and is represented not as the victor but as the vanquished; also that T.'s story, whether his own invention or another's, was not, so far as can now be seen, the common version.

Now T., having chosen, somewhat imprudently one may think, to celebrate separately the exploits of this almost inseparable pair, had for Polydeukes the match with Amykos ready to hand. For Kastor no such solo-part was available; he must take an exploit in which both are concerned and magnify Kastor's share in it. Hence, it is reasonable to guess, Kastor's self-sacrificing offer to fight for both, which appears in no other version. But why choose this story at all? Why not similarly manipulate some story from the Argonaut cycle?¹ That would add unity to the poem, whereas to place the quarrel with the Aphaidae in conjunction with an Argonaut story is to remind some at least of his readers that the combatants had once been shipmates.² Above all, why choose in order to glorify the prowess of Kastor the incident in which according to all other authorities³ he had been killed by his opponent?

And if T. must choose this story, why tell it in this form? If the combatants had to be cousins,⁴ why insist on the fact (170, 200)? The relationship does not make the quarrel any sweeter. Why choose the Leukippides as the cause of the quarrel? There the Dioscuri must needs be the aggressors, whereas in a quarrel over cattle it would have been easy to put them in the right or at least nearer it. Why

¹ The Dioscuri do not figure largely there, but, if T. did not choose to invent, the incident mentioned at Ap. Rh. 4. 650 seems capable of development.

² Ap. Rh. 1. 151; *Orph. Arg.* 180; Val. Fl. 1. 461; Apollod. 1. 9. 16; Hygin. 14. 15.

³ Except Hyginus.

⁴ Tyndareos was variously called son of Perieres and Gorgophone, of Oibalos and Gorgophone, and of Oibalos and a nymph Bateia; and was thus brother, half-brother, or unrelated, to Aphareus. See Roscher, 3. 696, 5. 1406.

insist that the Leukippides were properly and duly betrothed to the Aphaidae? Why suggest, as nobody else does, that in appropriating them the Dioscuri used fraud as well as force (149 ff.)?

And, finally, if he must tell this story in this form, why not tell it better? No doubt the speeches are effective and the fight adequate for its purpose, but the professed object of the poem is to glorify the Dioscuri, and Lynkeus' speech is therefore much too effective; it leaves his cousins, one would suppose, irremediably in the wrong. And though the duel will do, it is a mere pastiche from the *Iliad* which a poet soaked in Homer as T. was could write *currente calamo*. The piece has no beginning and no proper end; it has no setting (for the tombstone is required as a missile), no atmosphere, no characterization. Compare it with Part 2, or with *Id.* 13 or 24, and it is nought. Add that in two places T. has apparently not even thought out the implications of his own words.¹

From this scene of desolation let us avert our gaze and turn to Part 4.²

Part 4. *Epilogue* (212-23)

So you see, says T., paraphrasing but not improving Pindar (*N.* 10. 72), that it is best not to come to blows with the

¹ At 146 he arms his combatants with *μάχαιραι* which they cannot possibly carry; at 177 ff. he seems not to envisage the purpose of the proposed duel. I have written on these passages in *C.Q.* xxiv. 146, xiii. 22 respectively and need not repeat here what I said about them. My remarks on 146 had been, I find, anticipated by Könnecke (*Philol.* 72. 382), and the difficulty was noticed by C. Hartung (*Philol.* 34. 641). A possible explanation of the oversight will be found below.

² Schwartz (*Charakterköpfe*, 2. 63) regards Part 3 as a rewriting of an episode in the *Cypria*, parallel to the rewriting of an episode of the *Argonautica* in Part 2 and designed to instil the same principles of epic composition; and he draws no distinction between the style or merits of the two parts. Part 2 may well be called *reich an Einzelzügen, die sorgfältig ausziselbert sind*, but how Part 3 can be so called passes my comprehension; and I hope it will appear from what I have said that Part 3 is a very poor advertisement for any principle of composition. Besides, Part 3 has almost nothing except the characters in common with the story in the *Cypria*.

Dioscuri. So indeed Parts 2 and 3 have firmly established, though it is an odd moral for a composition which began by celebrating them as ἀνθρώπων σωτῆρες and θυητοῖς βοηθοῖς. The poem is then wound up in the manner of a Homeric Hymn:

χαίρετε Λήδας τέκνα, καὶ ἡμετέροις κλέος ὅμνοις
215 ἔσθλον δέ τε πέμποντε. φίλοι δέ τε πάντες ἀδεῖοι
Τυνδαρίδας Ἐλένη τε καὶ ἄλλους ἡράσσουν,
"Ποιοι οἱ διέπερσαν ἀρήσσοντες Μενελάου,
ἵμνοις κόδος, ἀνάκτες, ἐμήσατο Χίος ἀσιδός,
ἵμνησας Πριάμου πόλιν καὶ ἡγας Ἀχαιῶν
220 Πιεάδας τε μάχας Ἀχιλῆς τε πύργον ἀντῆς·
ἵμνοις αἱ καὶ ἔγω λιγέων μεικύματα Μονοέων,
οἱ αἰγαὶ παρέχοντι καὶ ὡς ἔμοις οίκους ὑπάρχει,
τοῖς φέρων. γεράνια δὲ θεοῖς καλλιστον ἀσιδά.

The natural and obvious meaning of 218-20 is that Homer wrote the *Iliad* in honour of the Dioscuri, the aorist participle ὕμνησας, by a common and familiar idiom,¹ covering the same action as that of the verb ἐμήσατο. But has T. forgotten, or can he hope that his audience will forget, that there is in the *Iliad* only one reference to the Dioscuri, and that is the famous passage (3. 236 ff.) where Helen scans the Greek ranks for them in vain, not knowing that they lie in their graves at home?

From this difficulty I see no real escape. It is useless for Hiller² to say that ὕμνοι in 218 means 'die Helden der Troischen Sage überhaupt'. It means, inevitably, the same as the anaphoric ὕμνοι of 221; and that, according to most analogy, should be the only people with whom T. is concerned in this poem³—the Dioscuri, who are incidentally the only people within range who can be included in the θεοὶ of 223. But let us grant that T. extends his view from the

¹ Goodwin, *M.T.*, § 150.

² It is less creditable to Hiller than discreditable to others that he is the only commentator to feel a difficulty.

³ The formal end of a hymn normally confines itself to the subject with which the hymn is concerned. In the *Homeric Hymns* slight exceptions of various types will be found in 1, 2, and 27 (cf. T. *Id.* 26), in 9 and 14, and in 31 and 32. Callimachus conforms to the norm except that in 4 Apollo and Artemis are joined to Delos, much as in *Id.* 16 Syracuse is joined to Hiero. *Id.* 17 is, I think, regular, for the formula (135) σέθεν δ' ἔγω λα καὶ ἄλλων μνάσομαι ἔμβεων is rather an assertion of Ptolemy's rank among the demigods than an inclusion of them in the tailpiece.

Dioscuri to a group comprising other heroes: ὕμνοι still includes the Dioscuri, and since this poem is devoted to them they must be not only of the group but in the centre of the front row. Yet it remains true that the *Iliad*, to which 218 ff. unmistakably refer, makes no contribution to their renown. And I hope that nobody will now suggest that ὕμνησας refers to earlier time than ἐμήσατο, and understand T. to mean that after completing the *Iliad* Homer sought to honour the Dioscuri, for I feel sure that nobody would so have taken the words. But take them so, and T. is still at fault, for if he had been thinking of the *Homeric Hymn* or the *Cypria* (the only Homeric or pseudo-Homeric works which are known to have mentioned the Dioscuri) he should never have dragged in the *Iliad* at all.¹ And whatever we make of this passage in detail, the broad fact remains that in a Hymn to the Dioscuri the less said about the *Iliad* the better. To mention it is to remind your audience that according to that high authority they were no gods but of the same clay as other heroes.

In short, T.'s epilogue, brief as it is, displays a negligence akin to that I find in Part 3.

By now the problem which I said at the outset was presented by this poem should be plain. It is how such finished work as is presented by Parts 1 and 2 comes to consort with such slovenly performances as Parts 3 and 4. And in general terms the solution seems to me fairly obvious; it is that the poem was not composed as a whole but was put together from components of which some were of independent origin.² The

¹ The Dioscuri, though their quarrel with the Apharidae and perhaps their rescue of Helen from Theseus (fr. 10 Allen) were recorded there, were in no sense the heroes of the *Cypria*, which was concerned with the antecedents of the Trojan war. Moreover, at 16. 48 ff., where Kyknos, a figure from the *Cypria*, is coupled with figures from the *Iliad*, T.'s plural ἀσιδά indicates that he did not ascribe the *Cypria* to the author of the *Iliad*.

² I should perhaps mention that Eichstaedt, *Adumb. Quaest. etc.*, 45 (Leipzig, 1793), dismissed the Idyll as 'hymnus e pluribus carminum particulis ab Alexandrino rhapsodo inepte consutus'. Legrand (*Buc. Gr.* 1. 181) is more nearly in agree-

de
no
no
is
bri
life
ne
fol
son
for
las
cop
od
It
ha
sho
arg
in
hy
exp
lon
inc
be
mer
fian
mon
is n
exc
T.'s
bili
of t
θε
Cyp
and
φοβ
χειρ
qui
of P

²

³
any
Id.
a re
in
Göt
that
Ber
Σωτ
cap
Pha
who
bett
rem
Παν
'Ελε

detailed history of the process one cannot hope to establish. What follows is no more than guesswork, and since it is no more I shall set it down quite briefly.

First, then, I think that Part 1 began life as an independent poem. It is nearly one still; all that links it to what follows is its last two lines, themselves somewhat oddly attached to the ecstatic vocatives which precede. Substitute for those two lines something like the last two of the Homeric Hymn which it copies,¹ and the vocatives are no longer odd, the poem is a rounded whole again. It is not inherently improbable that T. having written a poem for one purpose should adapt it to another, and I have argued elsewhere that he did the same in *Id.* 11;² and the existence of a short hymn to the Dioscuri requires no more explanation than the existence of the long one in which, as I think, it is now incorporated.³

Part 2, as I have said, I believe to be a demonstration of how Apollonius

should have written the beginning of his second book. The view that *Id.* 22 is a composite work in no way depends on that belief, but if Part 2 is what I suppose, it is intelligible that T. should wish to find a setting for it. Published by itself it would seem a direct attack; incorporate it in a frame and the criticism implied is more urbane and not the less effective. T.'s other criticism of Apollonius is ostensibly employed as an illustration of a proposition about love addressed to Nikias, but the connexion between the two is slight and it may well be that the first four lines of *Id.* 13 are no more than a pretext—a setting which converts criticism direct into criticism oblique and by implication.

I guess, then, that T., having Part 1, published or unpublished, by him and having composed Part 2 in criticism of Apollonius, cast about for a setting and conceived the idea of joining Parts 1 and 2 and of adding a Kastor episode and a tailpiece to make a whole. Part 1 is evidently, Part 2 is, as I hold, a rehandling of another man's poem; and if they have that in common the idea of combining them would easily suggest itself. And if the conception of *Id.* 22 arose in this way it would explain why T. has to celebrate the two Dioscuri separately, though for one of them no real solo-part can be found.

Part 3 is a puzzle. I do not think it a good poem, but my strongest objections are directed not to its intrinsic demerits but to the fact that the story, particularly in the form chosen, is unsuitable to its place in *Id.* 22. Therefore I hesitate to guess that it was composed *ab initio* as a complement to Parts 1 and 2. On the other hand, Kastor's proposal of a duel and his offer to represent his side do, as I have said, look as though they were designed to create for him the solo-part necessary to T.'s scheme. Part 4, if my criticism of it is valid, would prove that the final construction of *Id.* 22 upon the basis of Parts 1 and 2 was hasty and careless. It seems possible that this carelessness extends to the choice of story in Part 3 and that that part was in fact composed

ment with me; he speaks of '... un cadre insignifiant : à l'intérieur de ce cadre, T. a juxtaposé des morceaux qu'il lui plaisait d'écrire'. But Part 1 is not insignificant.

¹ They might be substituted as they stand except that *ταχέων ἐνθήτροπες ιππων* would repeat T.'s *ιππῆτες*. I do not, of course, exclude the possibility of minor alterations. For instance, in place of the Homeric line (*Il.* 3, 237, *Od.* 11, 300) *Κάστορά θ' ιππόδαμον καὶ πνέη ἄγαντον Πολυδένεικα*, where the *Cypria* (fr. 11 Allen) called Polydeukes *δεῖλοφόρον* and the Hymn *ἄμαλγον*, T. writes (2) *Κάστορα καὶ φοβερὸν Πολυδένεικα πνέη ἐρεθίζειν*, but his next line *χείρας ἐπιζεύχαρα μέρας βούσσουν ιμᾶντον*, which is quite separable, may be an addition in anticipation of Part 2.

² See *C.Q.* xxiv. 150.

³ There is no sort of indication where *Id.* 22 or any part of it was composed, but as in the case of *Id.* 18 (see *C.Q.* xxxiv. 116) Alexandria would be a reasonable guess, for the Dioscuri were popular in Egypt. The evidence is collected by Visser, *Götter u. Kulte*, 17, 83. It is worth remembering that after the deifications of Ptolemy I and Berenike there was in Egypt another pair of *Θεοὶ Σωτῆρες* to whom praise of the Dioscuri in that capacity would add some lustre; and that the Pharos was dedicated *Θεοῖς Σωτῆραι* (Strab. 8, 791) whom, as Wilamowitz says (*Textg.* 183), we had better not attempt to define further. Worth remembering also that Callimachus began his *Παννυχίς* with a *προοίμιον εἰς τὸν Διοσκούρους καὶ Ἐλένην* (*Dieg.* 10, 6), and employed the Dioscuri to transport Arsinoe to heaven (*ib.* 10, 12).

for its present position; more likely, perhaps, that, having by him a poem or fragment on the Dioscuri and Apharae, T. pulled it out of the drawer, added Kastor's speech, scribbled a duel out of the *Iliad*, and clapped the whole into place. That would explain¹ why the speech of Lynkeus, which is in no way bound up with Kastor's performance, is at once the most effective part of the piece and the most hideously unsuitable to its present position.

The purpose of this paper, let me repeat in conclusion, is to state a problem, not to solve it. That the problem is real I do not doubt, but the solutions which I have suggested may be far astray. They are guesses only, for anyone who can to improve upon.

A. S. F. Gow.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

¹ It would also afford a simple explanation of the oversight as to the arms mentioned (p. 15, col. 2, n. 1).

NOTES ON VIRGIL CAESAR IN THE FIRST GEORGIC

THE *Georgics* open with a statement to Maecenas of its aim and scope and an invocation of the gods of field and stall to bless the work. After them all the poet turns to address Caesar:

tuque adeo, quem mox quae sint habitura deorum
concordia, incertum est, urbisne invisere, Caesar,
terrarumque velis curam et te maximus orbis
auctorem frugum tempestatumque potentem
accipiat, cingens materna tempora myrto
(i. 24 ff.)

—whether you are to be god of the sea
or a new constellation in heaven,

quidquid eris (nam te nec sperant Tartara regem
nec tibi regnandi veniat tam dira cupidus,
quamvis Elysios miretur Graecia campos
nec repetita sequi curet Proserpina matrem),
da facilem cursum, atque audacibus adnue
coepitis,
ignarosque viae mecum miseratus agrestis
ingredere et votis iam nunc adsuesce vocari.
(36 ff.)

One minor difficulty of this passage can be met at once with a simple and direct explanation. Why is the curious suggestion that Tartarus might be the realm of the divine Caesar put forward at all, as it is only to be rejected? Because the *gens Iulia* had a special cult of the god Vejovis at Bovillae. Vejovis combined traits of Jupiter and Apollo, and was definitely chthonic in character. It might well seem natural to the *gens* to conform the divine honours paid to one of its members to those of the gentle god,¹ however inappropriate this might

¹ The honours paid to the deified Emperors must obviously have been modelled on those paid to the older gods. Coins of Divus Augustus show him with attributes of Jupiter and Apollo-Sol—thunder-

appear from a more general point of view.

The major difficulty of the passage remains. Who is Caesar here, and what is the meaning of the invocation?

Octavian, entering on the inheritance of the dictator, succeeded, of course, to the name of 'Caesar', and is so addressed by Virgil himself.¹ But it is not he who is invoked here. If ever Virgil overstepped the ordinary bounds of moderation in addressing divine praises to a living man, this is not one of the occasions. The *materna myrto* of v. 28 is peculiarly suitable to Julius,² and the whole discussion about the place to be assigned to him in heaven ('quem mox quae sint habitura deorum concilia, incertum est') cannot reasonably be transferred to Octavian. Any hint that the great man of the day has a heavenly destiny in store must be accompanied by an assurance that it lies a very long way ahead. It is Julius Caesar, definitely recognized as a god after the triumph of the Caesarian faction, but not yet assigned to a fixed place in worship, who is here invoked.

Does this suggest an earlier date for the first *Georgic* than has usually been assigned to it? And can we test the worth of the suggestion? At the close of the poem, Virgil passes on from signs

bolt and crown of rays. Again one thinks of Vejovis.

¹ e.g. *Georgics*, iii. 16, iv. 559 ff.; on *Georgics* i. 503 ff. see below.

² Octavian chose Apollo rather than Venus as his special patron.

of the weather to the signs given by the sun, when he shrouded his bright face in gloom:

extincto miseratus Caesare Romam. (466)

Then follow other portents, leading up to the final tragedy:

ergo inter sese paribus concurren[t] telis
Romanas acies iterum videre Philippi;
nec fuit indignum superis b[ea]s sanguine nostro
Emathiam et latos Haemi pinguescere campos.
(489 ff.)

Then comes the great appeal:

Di patrii, Indigetes, et Romule Vestaque mater,
quaes Tuscum Tiberim et Romana Palatia servas,
hunc saltem everso iuvenem succurrere saeclo
ne prohibe! sat is iam pridem sanguine nostro
Laomedontae luimus periuria Troiae;
iam pridem nobis caeli te regia, Caesar,
invidet atque hominum queritur curare triumphos.
(498 ff.)

Here we have had first Julius Caesar, impiously murdered, then young Caesar, *hic iuvenis*, who is to succour a ruined world: but who is the Caesar of 503, whom the Courts of Heaven grudge to the earth? Clearly, it is Julius reborn in his heir and successor—to be set free to attend again to mortal triumphs. Even so Octavian himself recognized in the comet of 42 B.C. the soul of the divine Julius and himself reborn in it.

On this showing, the date of the first *Georgic* would be very early indeed, not very long after Philippi, when Octavian returned to settle the soldiers on the Italian lands. The concluding lines of the poem fully confirm this view.

Hinc movet Euphrates, illinc Germania bellum
(509)

—this reference to fears of Parthians and Germans (or Dacians?) might equally well fall rather later. ‘Saevit toto Mars impius orbe’ (511): *impious* suggests ‘civil’ war, but the allusion might hold at least till Actium. But 510, 511

vicinae ruptis inter se legibus urbes
arma ferunt

are either vague and windy rhetoric—not like Virgil—or something much more definite—a groan over the miseries of the Perusian War of 40 B.C., when Italy was divided into two camps in war essentially ‘impious’, and such cities as Perusia and Praeneste broke bonds of

long alliance and renewed their ancient struggles with Rome.

DIANA—BELLONA

hos super advenit Volsca de gente Camilla,
agmen agens equitum et florentis aere catervas,
bellatrix, non illa colo calathisve Minervae
femineas adiusta manus, sed proelia virgo
dura pati cursuque pedum p[ro]aeverttere ventos.
(*Aeneid* vii. 803 ff.)

Who is the patron goddess of this gallant ‘virago’? Not Juno, the protectress of Turnus, not Minerva, here actually allotted to the arts of peace, even though she can be invoked by the matrons of the Latins as

armipotens, praeses belli, Tritonia virgo.
(xi. 483)

The answer, of course, is to be found in xi. 532 ff., where Diana (‘Latonia’) tells how Camilla was dedicated to her in infancy by her father, Metabus. Diana’s nursing was naturally brought up to love the chase, but not less to follow arms. Metabus

iaculo palmas armavit acuto
spiculaque ex umero parvae suspendit et arcum.
(574 f.)

The huntress Diana is perfectly suited to be the patroness of the young huntress. But what of the ‘bellatrix’? Does she too come quite naturally under the ward of Diana? Should she not rather look for protection to Bellona?

There is a simpler and very satisfying solution of the difficulty, hitherto rather obscured by a confusion of names. Bellona, ‘lady of war’, is not an independent goddess,—she is none other than Diana in her function of war-goddess. To the Greeks Artemis was best known as the virgin huntress, but even they knew her as the goddess of the Amazons and equated her with such warlike goddesses as Ma of the Cappadocians or Bendis of the Thracians. To the Romans the hunt counted as a kind of mimic war, a preparation in play for serious earnest. On Roman coins prowess in the chase, just as prowess in arms, is ascribed to the goddess Virtus. There is nothing really surprising then if war and the chase were assigned to the same goddess. It is not for nothing that Diana besides Mars is the patroness of gladiators.

More definite evidence can be added. In Horace, *A.P.* 453 ff., we read

ut mala quem scabies aut morbus regius urget
aut fanaticus error et iracunda Diana,
vesanum tetigisse timent fugiuntque poetam
qui sapiunt.

Wise men shun the poet as they shun other lunatics. Wilkins, in his edition of the poem, observes most justly that 'fanaticus error' is the frenzy inspired by Bellona in her dervish priests and that 'iracunda Diana' is an addition to the same conception. He only stops short of drawing the conclusion that Diana and Bellona are the same. There is a passage in Ovid, *Ex Ponto* I, i. 37 ff., where the poet claims admission for his poem, because it contains the praises of the gods—the Emperor and his family—and should therefore enjoy the same privileges as those accorded to priests:

ecquis ita est audax, ut limine cogat abire
iactantem Pharia tinnula sistra manu?
ante deum Matrem cornu tibicen adunco
cum canit, exiguae quis stipis aera negat?
scimus ab imperio fieri nil tale Dianae:
unde tamen vivat, vaticinator habet.

In this context, aligned with Isis and

A FRENCH BROADSHEET OF 1582 ON LATIN PRONUNCIATION

THERE exists in the library of St. John's College, Cambridge, a French broadsheet of which I do not know a copy elsewhere. It is entitled *Brief advertisement touchant la prononciation latine d'aucuns mots*, and was published in 1582, apparently at Pontoise. The type-page originally measured $13\frac{1}{2}$ by $9\frac{3}{4}$ inches, but at some time a narrow strip was cut away from the right-hand side. As a result, the ends of 54 lines of the text are missing; but the lower lines, being shorter, are unaffected. Apart from a small tear on the left-hand side, and a few holes here and there, the rest of the text is intact.

The author gives his name as Hercules Castilliard and describes himself as a priest, as senior Regent of the Collège de Pontoise, and as *bis puer*. Apart from the small fact that he was at some time incumbent of a chapel at Ivry-le-Temple and simultaneously Principal of the Collège de

Cybele, and associated with the prophesying priests, Diana can be none other than Bellona.

But, it may be said, all this is true only of the later Bellona, derived from Ma of the Cappadocians, and identified with Diana because *she* was identified by the Greeks with Artemis Tauropolis: the earlier, truly Roman Bellona was quite distinct. This objection soon falls. The clear distinction made by Wissowa in his *History of Roman Religion* between earlier and later Bellona is nowhere clear in our ancient records. The first Roman coins present a goddess who from her types and attributes must be taken to be Diana of Aricia, but who in history appears only under the name of Bellona.¹ The identity of the two goddesses, then, is original and essential.

H. MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

¹ The detailed argument is reserved for a later article—because of its general nature—in an archaeological journal.

Pontoise,' I have been unable to discover anything further about him, nor have I been able to trace a copy of a more substantial work, *De dissidio literarum et vocum prophana pronuntiatione*, which he says he has already published.

Rather more than half of the text of the broadsheet is in Latin prose, the remainder being in French prose and doggerel French verse. The broadsheet condemns any departure from the traditional pronunciation of Latin as barbarous and profane, and attacks those who have introduced a new pronunciation of certain Latin words. The innovators plead, says Castilliard, that the object of the changes is to make it easier for the young to learn Latin, that they have

¹ Marcel Lebrun, *Histoire du Collège de Pontoise 1564-1922*. Pontoise, 1923. I have not seen a copy of this work, and am indebted for the reference to Lieut.-Colonel E. Andrieu of Dijon, who tells me that the book contains no other reference to Castilliard.

been introduced into the classroom only and not into the church, and that they have removed the ambiguity previously caused by the use of a single pronunciation for Latin words differing from each other in spelling: *caepē* and *saepe*, for instance, or *cede* and *sede*. Castilliard replies that it is foolish to use one pronunciation in the classroom and another in church, and that the innovations have merely caused fresh confusion.

When Castilliard's statements are stripped of verbiage, we find that he wishes Latin to be pronounced in France (as in the past) as though it were French, and that the innovations to which he objects are three.

The first is the substitution of [kw] for [k] as the pronunciation of Latin *qu*. We know from other sources that this change had been introduced by Ramus and his colleagues at the Collège de France in 1552,¹ and that it had aroused strong opposition from the lecturers at the Sorbonne, who wished *quamquam* to be pronounced *kankan*, as in the past—hence the contemporary jest: 'La lettre Q fait plus de kankan que toutes les autres ensemble.'² The Sorbonne had even gone so far as to petition the Parlement of Paris to suppress the new pronunciation, but the Parlement had refused to take any action. Castilliard's broadsheet shows that both pronunciations of *qu* were in vogue thirty years later.

The second innovation to which Castilliard objects is concerned with the pronunciation of Latin *c* before *e* or *i*,

¹ A. Lefranc, *Histoire du Collège de France*, Paris, 1893, pp. 210–11.

² E. Andrieu, 'Notes sur la Prononciation du Latin dans l'Église de France', Appendix 4 to R. Moisset, *La Prononciation du Latin*, Dijon, 1928, p. 123.

which had hitherto been [s] in France. He represents the new pronunciation in two places by *g*, but everywhere else by *ch*, and there can be no doubt that he means either the [tʃ] of standard Italian or (more probably) the [ʃ] of the Roman dialect, which is spelled *ch* in French.

The third innovation is the pronunciation of Latin *ch* as [k], instead of (presumably) [ʃ].

Castilliard nowhere mentions Italy. Since, however, the pronunciations of *qu* as [kw], of *c* before *e* or *i* as [tʃ] or [ʃ], and of *ch* as [k] are all characteristic of Italian, it is clear that the innovators took the Italian pronunciation of Latin as their model, and that it was merely by coincidence that they reached the same conclusion about the pronunciation of Latin *qu* as did Ramus, who was inspired by Erasmian principles.

Since Castilliard was a French priest writing after the Reformation, and since part of the defence of the innovators was that they had not interfered with the ecclesiastical pronunciation of Latin, the broadsheet confirms two conclusions which I have stated elsewhere:¹ (1) that the pronunciation of Latin as though it were the vernacular cannot (as is so often done in England) be regarded as a deliberate Protestant invention to obliterate an alleged universal pronunciation of ecclesiastical Latin; (2) that, until the spread of the Italian pronunciation in ecclesiastical circles in modern times and the introduction of the reformed Classical pronunciation into academical circles in the second half of the nineteenth century, the normal practice in any country was to pronounce Latin, both ecclesiastically and academically, on the same principles as the vernacular.

Jesus College, Cambridge. F. BRITTAIN.

¹ F. Brittain, *Latin in Church*, Cambridge, 1934.

REVIEWS

ÆSCHYLUS AND ATHENS

George THOMSON: *Æschylus and Athens. A Study in the Social Origins of Drama.* Pp. xii+476. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1941. Buckram, 21s. net.

DENYING at the outset the possibility

of objective truth or historic impartiality, and laying down that the study of Æschylus ought itself to have a social or political motive (p. 5), Professor Thomson views Greek literature and

institutions in the light of his political theories, which are virtually those of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and having proved to his satisfaction that primitive tribes in all parts of the world were communists, he draws corresponding conclusions from these about early Greek institutions. He points to a number of real and illuminating analogies, collects very usefully the traces of totemism, exogamy, and matrilineal inheritance in primitive Greece, and throws some new light on certain figures in Greek mythology (Moirai, Erinyes, etc.) and on some points in the law of inheritance, but does not altogether escape the particular danger of this method—the assumption that because something was the case, e.g. in an Australian tribe, it must also have been the case, and its explanation the same, in Greece. His prophet in these matters is L. H. Morgan, the supposed neglect of whose work he ascribes to the fact that 'its implications are incompatible with the bourgeois attitude to contemporary society', whereas 'the anthropologists of the Soviet Union' have welcomed them. In fact I remember discussing Morgan's *Ancient Society* (1877) in detail with Tylor and other Oxford scholars many years before Professor Thomson was born, and disagreeing with some of his conclusions, from considerations not of political theory, but of evidence—my demand for which, in another context, leads Professor Thomson to inform his readers that I am incapable of thinking outside a narrow circle. Perhaps it is worth adding that, after a careful study of Schurtz, Spencer and Gillen, Webster, and others in my young days, I have been led in recent years to study the religious and social behaviour of certain African tribes, differing very widely from the Australian and suggesting that to draw conclusions for general application mainly from the latter (as some classical scholars tend to do) is very hazardous. What I am still prepared to insist on is that the evidence for the existence and meaning of Greek customs and institutions must be drawn from Greece itself before any certainty can be justified.

In accordance with his political preconceptions, Professor Thomson tells us that 'the mythical concept of the Moirai' is to be interpreted 'as a symbol of primitive communism' (p. 6); that in the Orphic brotherhoods 'men whom the class-struggle had humbled and oppressed fed on the illusion of a lost equality' (p. 21); that 'the Orphic conception of Love . . . represents a principle that involved a direct challenge to aristocratic thought. To the nobility Love was a dangerous thing, because it implied desire, ambition, discontent' (p. 156); that 'Ananke' (in Orphic doctrine) 'represents the principle that the labouring members of society are denied all share in the product of their labour beyond the minimum necessary to keep them labouring' (p. 158); that 'the primitive character of Orphism was due entirely to its class origin. The ruling class of Ionia' (including Thales and Anaximander) 'had risen to a far higher level, but only because it was the ruling class. They lived on the proceeds; the others paid the price' (p. 163); that 'the (Pythagorean) doctrine of the fusion of opposites in the mean was generated by the rise of the middle class intermediate between the landowners and the serfs' (p. 217); that the misapprehensions of those who differ from his interpretation of Æschylus arise 'because the social system under which we live is one we are all consciously or unconsciously ashamed of' (p. 305), and so 'they will not consider social problems in relation to the poet'; that the dithyramb in the fourth century 'was developed as an extravagant musical spectacle supplying an opiate to the people's unsatisfied desires' (p. 371); that the attitude of the Thracian Trausoi (Herod. v. 4, 2) towards life and death 'is the cry of a primitive people caught in the vortex of industrial exploitation' (p. 379); and that in tragedy 'the emotional stresses set up by the class-struggle are relieved by a spectacle in which they are sublimated as a conflict between man and God, or Fate, or Necessity' (p. 383). I shall be surprised if most of these propositions will commend themselves to the sober judgement of scholars.

A considerable portion of Parts I and II of the book is dominated by the theory that the development of private property was the root of all evil, carrying with it the subordination of women, the extinction of matrilinearity, the increased frequency of homicide, and so on; and unless this view is conceded, his interpretations will not all be acceptable; but I have only space to notice a few points. He does not convince me that the Moirai were originally the ancestral spirits of a matrilineal clan, or that patronymic clan-names (*Eumolpidai*, etc.) were really feminine.¹ The linguistic argument used on p. 30 to support the existence (which seems certain) of an early matrilineal system in Greece seems hazardous in so far as it depends upon a gloss of Hesychius on the otherwise unknown word *ēop*, which moreover seems not to mean exactly what the theory demands. There is little reason to believe that the special object of the festivals instituted by Pisistratus was 'to offset the *clan-cults* of the aristocracy', though no doubt they were meant to please the people. (I doubt also whether it was through the recitations that he ordered that the Homeric poems became known in Attica *for the first time*.) Professor Thomson surely exaggerates the direct influence of political conditions upon early literature and scientific thought. The fact (e.g.) that Anaximander, Pythagoras, and others, in default of a scientific terminology, adapted that of political and social life, does not imply that their doctrine was itself the result of political conditions; and I doubt if there is much sense in saying (p. 79) of Pindar's odes that '*in keeping with the static unity of the class for which they are composed*' (my italics) 'the structure of these odes is severely formal and entirely undramatic'. The statement is in any case not quite true, as some odes contain strongly dramatic elements within the roughly fixed, but still variable, outline.

¹ Nor, I suspect, were the Moirai represented as spinners of destiny because they were thought of as making the baby's clothes (p. 47): a better reason is given on p. 54.

Part III, 'The Origin of Drama', begins by showing that at certain critical times in the education of boys and girls in Sparta, Crete, and Athens some features of primitive tribal initiations are reproduced, as they are also in the legends of the Kouretes and of the birth of Dionysos. The mention of the boiling of Dionysos and Pelops leads to an account of the Olympian games in which Professor Cornford is closely followed; it is conjectured that not only the Olympian festival but also the Eleusinian Mysteries were originally celebrated by women, and initiation ceremonies are called in to explain many elements in the Mysteries. The paradox at the foot of p. 123, that 'the main reason why our evidence for the actual content of the Eleusinian Mysteries is so slight is probably not that the secrets were so well kept, but that they were so well known' is not well established. Nor is it at all certain that the *Æschylean* *πάρα τὸ φῶς ιδεῖν*—surely a common enough metaphor apart from any Mysteries—contains a reference to Eleusis. The play with the word *ἐπόπται* (pp. 126-7), though amusing enough, also fails to prove the use of the language of the Mysteries at Olympia and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Pollux III. 140 gives *ἐπόπται* as one of many synonyms of *ἀγωνοθέται*, but the use of *ἀγωνοθέτης* was not confined to the Olympian games, which Pollux does not mention. The word used in Hebrews xii is not *ἐπόπται* at all; but Professor Thomson tells us that 'the cloud of witnesses are the *επόπται*'. So for that matter are the Old Blues, now equipped with bicycles; for there can be little doubt that further research would show that the organization of the modern university, for work and play alike, goes back ultimately to the same source'. If the research were conducted by Professor Thomson, it probably would.

The story of Dionysos and Pentheus is explained as reflecting a tribal fertility-rite, performed in spring by a thiasos of women, and so are other Dionysiac legends (particularly those involving pursuits), while the story of Io is traced (perhaps less probably) to

the ritual of a totemic cow-clan. There follows a chapter on Orphism, the development of which is related to the victimization of workers by industry and particularly the mining industry. I am not convinced by this, or by the derivation from the mines of the topography of Tartarus (p. 162) and of the imagery (in Plato, *Rep.* VII) of what Professor Thomson oddly calls 'the cave of Er'. I also find some difficulty in his treatment of two puzzling lines from an Orphic tablet (pp. 125 and 159): *κύκλου δ' ἔξεπταν βαρυπενθέος ἀργαλέοι | ἵμερτον δ' ἐπέβαν στεφάνου ποσὶ καρπαλίμοισι*. These he renders 'I have flown off the wheel of grief and misery, and with swift feet I have attained unto the crown desired.' But surely *ἔξεπταν* must be 'out of', not 'off', and *ἐπέβαν* 'set foot on' or 'within'. The two lines seem to present a contrast between escaping out of an undesirable *κύκλος* and getting inside a more desirable one—the first probably the cycle of recurrent births and deaths, the second perhaps either the company of the blest or the boundary of their habitation.

The formula in which Professor Thomson summarizes a tribal initiation, viz. *πομπή* (the boys are sent off from home), *ἀγών* (they undergo an ordeal), *κῶμος* (they return in triumph), is made to explain not only the Olympian games and the plot of the *Bacchae* (to both of which it can plausibly be applied, though with some differences in the meaning of the words), but also the ritual of the Great Dionysia. There was certainly a *πομπή* to and from Eleutherai, and a *κῶμος*, but it is less satisfactory that the sacrifice of the bull has to do duty for the *ἀγών*. The conception of an *ἀγών* requires resistance and an antagonist, and it does not help to say that the bull was really Dionysos. So apparently (p. 169) was the sacrificing priest, whom Professor Thomson identifies with the leader of the choir, the poet; so that the god must have sacrificed himself to himself. I can find no evidence whatever of any consciousness on the part of the Greek worshippers that in sacrificing the bull they were sacrificing the god; the expression quoted from a well-

known inscription, describing the bull as 'worthy of the god', really tells the other way.

As for the dithyramb, the author conjectures that the singers were originally women. The evidence offered is (1) That at the City Dionysia the boys' choirs were older than the men's. (In fact there is no evidence to show when they were instituted, and in any case boys are not women.) (2) That the use of the phrase **Ωραι αἱ Διονυσιάδες* in Simon, *Epigr.* 148—a personification of the season of the Dionysiac festival—implies that the performers at the festival had been feminine. (Does it?) (3) That there was a thiasos of women at Eleutherai involved in the myth of Dionysos Melanaigis, whom he apparently identifies with D. Eleuthereus. (A doubtful identification, which Farnell abandoned; and in any case did these women sing a dithyramb?) He suggests further that the place was named Eleutherai from these women 'set free' or 'turned adrift' when they had been driven mad. *Quibus qui falli potest, debet.*

The argument by which the author derives tragedy from dithyramb assumes, among other things (1) that the exarchon of the dithyramb impersonated the god, (2) that at one time the primitive dithyramb was mimetic, (3) that the dithyramb was or included an *agon*. I can see no evidence for any of these statements. The author further assumes (by a bold *petitio principii*) that 'the crucial test of any reconstruction of the history of tragedy' is 'its compatibility with the evidence of Aristotle, who, besides being incomparably better informed than we are, was the masterly exponent of a scientific method'. We do not in fact know how well-informed Aristotle was about pre-Æschylean tragedy, and as the scientific method which he expounded did not prevent his 'reconstructing' supposed facts on theoretical grounds in his biological works, it may not have done so in his literary history, though I should warmly welcome an account of early tragedy consistent with Aristotle, if it were backed by sufficient evidence. Professor Thomson wastes some words (pp. 180-1) in an attack

on myself in regard to the inclusion of grotesque elements in primitive tragedy, but in fact there is little or no difference between us on this point.

Since *ἀποκριτής* originally meant 'interpreter', Professor Thomson argues that it = *ἐξηγητής*, and as *ἐξηγητής* also means 'leader', *ἐξηγητής* = *ἐξάρχων*, and it follows that the *ἐξάρχων* of the dithyrambic chorus and the actor in tragedy were interpreters to the bystanders of the mysteries of a thiasos or secret society. Similarly stichomythia with its riddling language (the instances of which are in fact very few) arises from the *viva voce* examination of initiates into the thiasos, and *anagnorisis* is derived from the self-revelation of the god after his re-birth or resurrection in the ritual of the thiasos, in which he proved his identity by revealing sacred objects or mystical symbols. The evidence that this happened in any known Greek cult is not given. The author asserts that Aristotle's remarks make it clear 'that the recognition was a constant and radical feature of the convention' in tragedy. In fact they show just the opposite—that there was a whole class of tragedies in which there was *no* recognition (*Poet.* X), and the little evidence that there is suggests that the development of this element came later rather than earlier in the history of tragedy. In the rest of Professor Thomson's reconstructed history of tragedy (which is summarized on pp. 195-6) I find much inconclusive conjecture.

Part IV begins with an interesting and in some points unconventional account of Athenian history from Cleisthenes to Ephialtes, and of Pythagoras ('the first great exponent of democratic thought') and of the Pythagorean philosophy as determined by political considerations: there seems to be some exaggeration here. Chapter XIV discusses mainly the tetralogy and trilogy as forms of composition and contains a number of good points. But I doubt the explanation of the development of tragedy and comedy by the tension between political classes, and Professor Thomson's expressions of contempt for

myself will not convince me of the soundness of Professor Cornford's theory of comedy, despite my very sincere respect for the learning and ingenuity of its author, until some proof is given that the ritual which he assumes ever existed or that it would explain the actual facts of comedy if it had. On pp. 232-3 it is assumed that the dithyrambs came last in the Dionysiac competitions, but in fact the order of the competitions is quite uncertain and there is no agreement about it.

At last we come to *Æschylus*. Chapter XV gives a vivid and often illuminating exposition of the *Oresteia*. I cannot, however, see a conscious use of the language of the Mysteries wherever Professor Thomson finds it, and there is really nothing in the trilogy—not even in *Eum.* 997 *χαίρετ' ἐν αἰσθάναις πλούτον*—about the institution of private property, nor about the emancipation or subjection of women. It may be doubted if the author would have laid such stress on this, but for an opera turning on the emancipation of women which he enjoyed in Moscow. 'It was then that I realised for the first time the nature of the inspiration behind the *Oresteia*' (p. 297, reinforced by references to Engels and Lenin on p. 449). Nor does anything in the *Eumenides* itself suggest that 'Apollo represents in this trilogy the rule of the landed aristocracy'. In the course of a good discussion of the earlier plays it is sad to learn that 'the influence of private property on the morals of the proprietors raises issues which contemporary critics' (here Professor D. S. Robertson) 'are instinctively reluctant to explore', and Professor Thomson is hardly just to the *Persians*.—On p. 304 a good deal turns on the adoption of the doubtful emendation *ἀνοίτο* in *Suppl.* 332. I think, speaking generally, that the author fails to establish his view that 'the fundamental question which engrossed *Æschylus* all his life was this—how had the tribal society enshrined in these' (i.e. local Attic) 'traditions evolved into the democratic state which he had helped to establish?' He was certainly interested in certain factors in this development,

but the fundamental and living problem for him was a problem of the divine government of the world. This appears to be as true of the *Prometheia* as of his other work. Professor Thomson leaves me quite unconvinced that the development of the myth of Prometheus was 'conditional on the division of society into economically unequal classes' (p. 318), and that Æschylus regarded the reconciliation of Zeus and Prometheus as a symbol of the democratic revolution (p. 345). I doubt also whether Prometheus' 30,000 years in Hades, for a unique offence, had anything to do with the Orphic and Empedoclean 10,000 years' cycle of births and deaths (for quite different kinds of offences); and I must protest against the statement (p. 340) that 'Æschylus himself had taught that God, as well as man, was a product of evolution'. He probably did present in this trilogy a certain development in the character of Zeus, but that is a totally different thing.

Chapter XVIII, 'After Æschylus', needs a longer discussion than can be given here. I feel that the influence of economic and political conditions on the poetry of Sophocles is greatly exaggerated, but there is an admirable exposition of the *Electra*. The treatment of Plato is very one-sided. The concluding chapter discusses Aristotle's theory of *kátharos*, and has some value in reference to the psychological theory of art and poetry, though I am not sure that Aristotle would have accepted all that Professor Thomson reads into him.

I add a few out of many notes made in passing. (1) If, as on p. 20, Nestor and his descendants are to be connected with a horse-totem, it would be better to do so by reference to Nestor's descent from Poseidon than by making *īnnóra* mean horse-man. It is applied too freely to other heroes in its regular sense of 'horseman' to warrant this. (2) The Diipolia may go back to the periodic feast of a primitive bull-clan, but I doubt whether this is true of 'the feasts of the Achaeans described by Homer.' A simpler explanation seems possible.

(3) Professor Thomson has hardly improved upon Milton when he writes of 'the goddess of the abhorred shears who cuts the thin-spun thread' (p. 46). (4) It seems impossible to read a quasi-initiatory re-birth (pp. 108, 280) into *Eum.* 760, where Orestes only says that he is at home again in Argos. (5) In what way was it *significant* (p. 309) that Æschylus had Pericles as choregos for the *Persians*? Presumably their association was due to the accident of the lot. (6) The ascription to Dr. Sheppard of the first production of Sophocles' *Electra* on the modern stage leaves out of account the very fine performance at the Aldwych Theatre in December 1909 by the ladies of Bedford College and their friends. This performance brought out clearly (as perhaps any actual performance must) the point in which Professor Thomson is interested—the impossibility of supposing that Sophocles regarded the attitude and action of Orestes and Electra as entirely satisfactory.

I cannot conclude without deprecating the language which Professor Thomson thinks fit to employ of some great scholars of an older generation. He accuses Burnet of 'slipshod thinking, which glides with a deceptive facility past all the crucial issues'—an absurdity to those who knew Burnet well and remember how his rigorously logical mind was at once a tonic and a terror to his friends. In the same spirit a passage of Bury's *History* is quoted as 'the sort of nonsense on which the younger generation looks up but is not fed' (p. 447), and Dr. E. M. Walker's account of the fall of Themistocles is described as 'mere tittle-tattle'. An opinion of Mahaffy is said to be 'sheer rubbish', due to his sharing the ideal of the Anglo-Irish aristocracy. I agree in thinking the opinion mistaken, but it was held by many scholars who had nothing to do with the Anglo-Irish or any other aristocracy and who supported it by respectable argument. It is a pity that the discussion of questions of scholarship should be degraded by language of this kind.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

GREEK TRAGEDY

Gilbert MURRAY: Sophocles, *The Antigone*. Translated into English rhyming verse, with Introduction and Notes. Pp. 94. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1941. Cloth, 3s. (paper, 2s.) net.

William Nickerson BATES: *Sophocles, Poet and Dramatist*. Pp. xiii+291; 6 plates. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press (London: Milford), 1940. Cloth, 21s. 6d. net.

Edwin Everitt WILLIAMS: *Tragedy of Destiny: Oedipus Tyrannus, Macbeth, Athalie*. Pp. 35. Cambridge, Mass.: Éditions XVII Siècle, 1940. Cloth, \$1.50 (paper, 80c.).

IF, because of the wrath of the gods, a man had to write something on the differences between the Classic and the Romantic, he might do worse than begin with two passages in which two poets, one ancient and one modern, describe a similar incident, the death by hanging of a tragic heroine:

ἔπειτα μῆτηρ καὶ γυνή, διπλοῦν ἔπος,
πλεκταῖσιν ἀράναισι λωβᾶται βίον.

Remember her, his mother and his wife,
And that dim, swinging rope that broke her life.

He might point out that the Greek is not unadorned, and does not lack τὸ ξενικόν; that its Greek quality may be seen in the subtle way in which the ornament is used. The epithet πλεκταῖσιν is a plain one, and it is there simply to indicate the idea of 'rope'; and πλεκταῖσιν ἀράναισι suggests 'a rope used for hanging' sufficiently for the poet to be able to use, instead of the plain verb 'hanged herself', the more highly coloured λωβᾶται βίον; which is itself dramatically more effective and natural in Ismene's mouth. The modern poet, on the other hand, has his plain 'rope', then adds the pictorial adjective 'swinging', then the vaguely evocative adjective 'dim', producing a stained-glass effect of the kind that our more educated writers to-day love to call 'nostalgic'. Finally, the critic would point out that the second couplet is Professor Murray's translation of the first.

Rhyming verse as a vehicle for Euripides has not commended itself to all Euripides' friends: as a vehicle for Sophocles it is open to special objections. Professor Murray adopts it, as he reminds us in the introduction to this translation, as an equivalent of the formal strictness of the Greek metre and the 'conventional poetic diction'; but surely the only equivalent worth thinking about is the one which shall allow us to feel as directly as possible the effect of the original, and that seems not to be rhyme. When Sophocles' pace is slow—as at the beginning of Creon's opening speech—the rhyme is at least not more out of place than in a translation of Euripides:

Elders of Thebes, the vessel of our state
Though shaken in wild storms, by God's good fate
Stands upright once again, and you from all
The folk of Thebes are here by separate call.

Perhaps we may still cleave to Milton's opinion about rhyme in heroic verse, but we can hardly say that the rhyme here is holding up the pace. At the end of a speech, especially one that ends sententiously, the rhyme falls gratefully, reminding us how sure the Elizabethan instinct was on this point:

Now is the day to show thee nobly brave,
Or born a princess, but at heart a slave (vv. 38 f.)

But surely the chief virtue of Sophocles' style, certainly the point in which it differs most from that of Euripides, is that it has at command every degree of weight and speed. In the more tense and nervous passages, so unlike anything that Euripides ever attempted or thought of, the rhyme spoils everything, even Professor Murray's abundant felicities. Compare with the above passage vv. 514-17:

C. Him thou dost outrage, honouring thus his foe.
A. The peaceful dead will not regard it so.
C. One with a traitor's thou wilt make his grave?
A. A brother 'twas that smote him, not a slave.

The original quivers and races; the translation by comparison has the movement and passion of a minuet.

Professor Bates includes translations of selected passages in his book, and

though they sometimes lack grace they stick to the Greek, and give a good idea of what Sophocles said, to a reader whose chief desire is to know that. Here is *πολλὰ τὰ δεινά* in the two versions:

Many and wondrous things there are,
And none more wonderful than Man.
Over the hoary seas he goes,
The stormy south-wind drives him on,
With billows surging round about.
Earth, supreme among the gods,
Imperishable and intact,
He wears away from year to year
With courses of his mule-drawn plough.

Wonders are many, but none there be
So strange, so fell, as the Child of Man.
He rangeth over the whitening sea,
Through wintry winds he pursues his plan:
About his going the deeps unfold,
The crests o'erhang, but he passeth clear.
Oh, Earth is patient, and Earth is old,
And a mother of Gods, but he breaketh her,
To-ing, fro-ing, With the plough-teams going,
Tearing the body of her year by year.

Professor Bates's book is addressed mainly to Greekless readers of Sophocles, to give them 'more information about the writer and his work, and above all . . . the evidence upon which statements about him are based . . . adding references to the more important authorities'. It is a careful compilation, but an oddly designed book. Of the 291 pages, 36 are given to a biography of Sophocles, a conventional chapter on his dramatic art, and a short account of the development of the satyric drama. The rest of the book is divided nearly equally between a chapter on the extant plays and another on the lost plays—every one of them, including the 'possibly destroyed'. Since in this latter chapter full references are given to the literature of the subject that has appeared since Pearson's *Fragments*, it will be useful to the serious student of Sophocles; but one wonders what the Greekless will make of it; and what the serious student will think of the previous chapter. For nearly half of this expensive book consists of précis of the plots of the seven plays so intense that nine pages (not including the interspersed translations) are given to a pure summary of the plot of the *O.T.* alone.

It makes one wonder if there are students of Sophocles who do not propose even to read him in an English translation. It is obvious that the author has given loving and minute attention to Sophoclean scholarship, but the book does not justify its size and price.

Mr. Williams, finding that the *Tyrannus*, *Macbeth*, and *Athalie* make on his mind an effect more powerful than any other tragedy, asks if these plays do in fact belong to a distinct species, 'Tragedy of Destiny'. The question is a large one for thirty-five small pages; and although the author makes some interesting points, his method is not rigorous enough to enforce any conclusions.

He states many points of similarity between these plays, some true, others true but not of these plays only, others doubtful. In each play the hero does what he does in order to thwart (or fulfil) a prophecy: the prophecy is misunderstood, is explained only when it brings about the catastrophe, and fills the play with tragic irony. Each play stands out from among its fellows for excellence of plot: the heroes are similar in character (which seems a little hard on Oedipus) and all three end fighting. These are some of the points of resemblance.

But when we are told that these plays gain more from repetition than any other form of literature, and that foreknowledge of the result does not destroy our interest in the conflict, we want to ask Mr. Williams if he is really outlasting his interest in the *Oresteia* or *Hamlet*. We are told too that each play gains in magnitude by being linked with the welfare of the nation, or (in the case of *Athalie*) of the whole human race: the plot of *Athalie* is concerned with the seed of David, of the *Tyrannus* with the tomb of Oedipus that was to preserve Athens, of *Macbeth* with laments for Scotland and the reign of James. A forced comparison; and Oedipus is not linked with Attica in the *Tyrannus*. And, having mentioned the plague as evidence for the strong social interest of the *Tyrannus*, Mr. Williams should

are
pro-
English
the
minute
ship,
size

ran-
his
any
o in
cies,
n is
ges;
ome
not
con-

arity
mers
mers
oes
ful-
mis-
it
ills
day
for
ular
ard
ng.

m-

These
an
at
ot
we
ly
or
ay
th
of
the
ne
th
e-
ts
s.
is
st
d

have noticed the remarkable fact that when the play gets going the plague is completely forgotten.

But however striking the resemblances are, they prove little unless it is shown (a) that in general these points are true of tragedy of destiny only, not, for example, of tragedy of character; and (b) that they are, in general, true of *all* tragedies of destiny. Our con-

fidence in the author's method is shaken therefore when, on the last page but two, he says that the species 'Tragedy of Destiny' 'would appear to include *Antigone*, the *Septem*, *Agamemnon*, and the *Choephoroi*', and possibly *Phèdre*. Then why are these plays not included in Mr. Williams's examination of the species?

H. D. F. Kričto.

University of Glasgow.

VENIZELOS' TRANSLATION OF THUCYDIDES

Θουκυδίδου *Ιστορίαι. Κατὰ Μετάφρασιν* 'Ελευθερίου Βενιζέλου. Edited, with Preface, by Demetrios Caclamanos. In two volumes. Pp. xix+363, iv+304; 2 plates. Oxford: University Press, 1940. Cloth, 21s. (on hand-made paper in quarter-parchment binding, 42s.).

It is an affectation to deny that Thucydides' *History* to-day 'in the more elegant language of the *Daily Telegraph*, "palpitates with actuality"'; and it was with a lively interest that we heard that one of the most distinguished of modern statesmen, himself a Greek, had written a translation and a full commentary. The learned world would have welcomed the latter even more than the former; but it was not only too copious (eleven manuscript volumes) for immediate publication, but, one surmises, not prepared for the press by the author, being rather the notes he made for himself. We must therefore for the present be content with the translation. This was made of course primarily for Venizelos' own countrymen; and no foreigner, unless he knows Modern Greek as well as he knows his mother tongue, is properly competent to criticize it. Certainly I can make no such claim; and the remarks which follow must be read with that reserve.

In an interesting and sympathetic preface¹ Mr. D. Caclamanos relates the genesis and accomplishment of the work during Venizelos' voluntary exile from Greece, which followed his defeat in the elections at the end of 1920; he

tells us too that a suggestion was made to him that the translation should be submitted to a committee of classical professors, to revise and polish it. Fortunately this nervous proposal was rejected; the translation is Venizelos' own, no one else's. Nor was any correction, of the kind that professed scholars could without offence offer to the amateur, necessary; Venizelos knew Classical Greek well, and had made a long study of Thucydides—he did not rush into print.

The criticism which I would make, hesitatingly, is of a very different kind. Mr. Caclamanos explains that Venizelos was, 'like any well-informed and intelligent Greek', a convinced adherent of the 'popular' language; but argues, unconvincingly (and, I suspect, unconvinced), that he was right to reject this as unsuitable to a translation of Thucydides. The result, anyhow, is an easy-flowing example of the *katharévousa*, easy to read (too easy for Thucydides), yet full of phrases and constructions which jar. It is to be remembered what is the origin of the *katharévousa*: not entirely the 'purification' of a vulgar tongue, but (so Koraës wished) the bringing of Greek into line with Western-European languages, especially French. Hence it is full of expressions which are literal translations of French or English, but which seem alien to Greek: here are a few examples from this translation—διὰ τῆς δικαστικῆς ὁδοῦ (i. 39. 1), ἐπικουρία διὰ τὴν περίπτωσιν ἀνάγκης (i. 58. 1), ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς ὄποιας παραίτησις (ii. 63. 2), πνευματώδης παρατίρησις (iii. 38. 6), ἡ παράτασις αὐτὴ ὡφείλετο εἰς τὴν προκήρυξιν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων, ἡ ὄποια εἶχε προσδιορίσει

¹ A Greek translation of this was promised as introduction to vol. ii; but for some reason this has not been done. A pity.

μεγάλας χρηματικὰς διατιμήσεις (iv. 26. 5). Phrases of this kind now of course come easily to any Greek in writing or formal speaking; and Venizelos was an accomplished orator, trained when the *katharevousa* was enforced in law-court and parliament. In that sense they are not artificial; but, for all that, they read as journalese, at least to the foreigner; and no lover of Greek, ancient or modern, can read without pain *οἱ μὲν καὶ οἱ δέ, διαβάλλοντο οἱ μὲν τοὺς δέ, ἐπολέμοντο οἱ μὲν καὶ τῶν δέ* (worst of all, for *καὶ* with the genitive is a classical revival), familiar though such phrases are in Athenian journals. We have too that perhaps mistaken, but certainly inevitable, feeling of inconsistency: why in i. 24. 5 *πρὸ τοῦ παρόντος πολέμου* and i. 25. 4 *πρὸν ἀπ' αὐτούς*, which is the modern form? Why is *ἀπό* with the accusative allowed, both in the sense 'away from' and for the agent? We find *τριάντα, σαράντα*, etc., regularly, but sometimes *εἴς*, sometimes *ἔνας*; *χείρ, χεῖρες* normally, but sometimes *χέρι, ἄρτος* and *οὐλος*, but occasionally *ψωμί* and *κρασί*; both *μετά* with the genitive and *μαζὸν μέ* or *μέ* with the accusative. And how vivid the narrative becomes, how much more like the original, when Venizelos allows himself the freedom of *ἄλλὰ μόλις τὸν ἔβγαλαν, ἀπέθανεν ἀμέως* (i. 134. 3). In consequence, it is in passages of simple narrative that the translation reads best (Themistocles in Sparta is a good example), in the involved and rhetorical parts that it pleases least.

This last is not due to any avoidance of difficulties, or any obscurity in the translation; for Venizelos had the first of the translator's virtues, a determination to discover what his author meant and to give that meaning, if necessary (as often with Thucydides) at much greater length in order to make the meaning clear. This results in a loss of force compared with the original, but it will be a great help to the Greek student for whom Venizelos wrote; and it is not often that he misses the rhetorical point as he does by his very long rendering of the incisive *εἴ τις καὶ τόδε ἐν τῷ παρόντι δεδιὼς ἀπραγμοσύνῃ*

ἀνδραγαθίζεται (ii. 63. 2): *καὶ ἐὰν μερικοί, κατὰ τὴν παρούσαν κρίσιν, ἐκ φόβου καὶ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀποφυγῆς φροντίδων, εἶναι διατεθειμένοι καὶ τὴν θυσίαν αὐτὴν νὰ στέρξουν, διὰ νὰ ἐπιδειχθοῦν, ὅτι ἐπιδιάκονοι εἰρηνόφιλον πολιτικήν* (this is the translation at its weakest; and by it, as well, Cleon's imitation of Pericles, iii. 40. 4, rendered *διὰ νὰ ἡμπορῆτε νὰ ἐπιδεικνύετε ἀκαδύννως τὴν γενναιοφροσύνην σας*, is lost). Sometimes also the logical connexion is missed, as between cc. 21 and 22 of Book I (where indeed it has been missed by many). In general however, there is a gain in clarity with the loss in style; only occasionally have I noticed an unnecessary obscurity due to vocabulary. A simple instance is the use of *πλοῖα* both for *τριήρεις* (as in i. 26. 4; *τριήρεις* is kept just before) and for *πλοῖα* (ii. 67. 3); a more difficult one is the use of *συνετός*: this in modern Greek means *σώφρων* (at least in much of its classical meaning) as well as 'intelligent', but it surely obscures Thucydides' meaning to translate *σωφροσύνη* by *σύνεισις* in i. 32. 4 (and 37. 2), to keep *σωφρονῶ* in 40. 2 and *σώφρων* in 79. 2 (where *ξυνετός* is rendered *ἰκανός*) and *σύνεισις* in 75. 1, and finally in 84. 2 to render *σωφροσύνη ἔμφρων* by *λελογισμένη νηφαλιότης* (too narrow and too learned a term anyhow) and in 84. 3 *εὐβούλοι* by *συνετοί, τὸ εὐκοσμον* by *νηφαλιότης*, and then (apparently) *αἰδὼς* by *σύνεισις*, and *εὐβούλοι* again by *συνετοί*. (Nor, I think, is *γενναιοῖ* here the proper translation of *πολεμικοί*, which means 'good soldiers'.) In iii. 82. 4 *τὸ σώφρον* and *τὸ ξυνετόν* appear again as *σωφροσύνη* and *σύνεισις*, and just below *ξυνετός* as *εὐφνής, δεινός* as *ἰκανός*. In most of these passages Thucydides' careful distinctions are blurred. On the other hand, *ἐλπίς* has in modern Greek a narrower range than in ancient, and means only 'hope', not 'expectation'; but in iv. 28. 5 *ἡλπίζον* means 'expected', and should not be rendered by *ἐλπίς*.

For all that, this translation will be warmly welcomed by scholars, for in general it is accurate, clear, and decided. There are naturally passages of which the meaning, and the reading, are dis-

puted, and I would not always follow Venizelos' choice (e.g. vi. 40. 1); but only one (i. 82. 1) where I have detected a mistranslation. I have also found only one misprint (*κρατεῖ* for *κρατήσει*),

i. 68. 4)—the University Press deserve the tribute Mr. Caclamanos pays them.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

ARISTOTLE'S DEVELOPMENT

F. J. C. J. NYUENS, S.J.: *Ontwikkelingsmomenten in de Zielkunde van Aristoteles*. Een historisch-philosophische Studie. Pp. viii+346. Nijmegen and Utrecht: Dekker & van de Vegt. 1939. Paper.

W. JAEGER's well-known book on Aristotle¹ put forward for the first time a consistent picture of the philosopher's development. He thought that three stages could be clearly distinguished, viz.² (1) one at which Aristotle reproduces faithfully, though with significant changes of details, the conceptions of his master Plato; (2) a period of criticism of and emancipation from Plato; and (3) the establishment of *Fachwissenschaften* based on his new critical philosophy. The whole development is to be understood as an unbroken movement away from the Platonic metaphysics of Forms towards a general science of Reality. This view has been contested from different quarters; for example, M. A. Mansion³ pointed out, I think convincingly, that this clear-cut division into three periods is rather too neat to be convincing or probable. A serious void was left by Jaeger in the field of natural science, and it is in this realm that Dr. Nuyens seeks to establish new evidence.

His book, written in Dutch, but furnished with summaries in French and German, proposes to trace the development of Aristotle's doctrine of the soul. He hopes, at the same time, to lay down a new Aristotelian chronology.

Dr. Nuyens starts from Sir D'Arcy Thompson's observation,⁴ recently emphasized again by Sir David Ross,⁵ that

there is much in Aristotle's zoological writings which points to collections made during his stay on the coast of Asia Minor in his 'middle period', and so suggests the origin of at least some of the most important biological treatises at that time rather than, according to Jaeger, in his last years. This would bring back some scientific works from the last to the middle period, and, consequently, upset Jaeger's reconstruction of the last, 'scientific' stage. Although it could be argued that those collections were made at a later time by pupils of Aristotle, Thompson's view has so much plausibility that it ought to be regarded at least as a working hypothesis.

Nuyens accepts this view, taking the psychological doctrine propounded in those writings as characteristic for the middle period. He explains Aristotle's theory of that time as a modified Platonism, a dualist theory of the soul localized in and governing the body. This doctrine is shown to be quite different from the first stage at which body and soul are taken as two separate entities, strongly opposed to one another. A still longer step divides it from the last period, represented in *De Anima*, which proclaims the soul as the entelechy of an organic body. Then the soul is necessarily connected with the whole of the body, not with a specific part: the soul can no longer be localized.

This is an interesting basis for further discussion and research, especially since a similar scheme has recently been put forward as a principle for the analysis of *De Anima* itself.⁶ But it also demands a far closer interpretation than is given by Nuyens.

There is little doubt that such observations must have a bearing on the general question of Aristotelian chronology. Nuyens applies his threefold

¹ Berlin, 1923; English translation, Oxford, 1934.

² *Revue Néo-Scolastique*, xxix (1927).

³ Arist., *Hist. Animalium*, Oxford translation, p. vii.

⁴ *Aristotle: Selections*, p. xvi.

⁵ H. Langerbeck, *Gnomon*, xi (1935), 418.

scheme to the task of dating Aristotle's treatises, whatever their subject, according to their 'early', 'middle', or 'late' psychological doctrine. But no single principle, however important, can have more than a relative value for dating the whole *Corpus Aristotelicum*. Aristotle, a philosopher, not a psychologist, might have had more than one good reason for putting forward different psychological doctrines in treatises of the same period. Thus, the *Eudemian* and the *Nicomachean Ethics*, two writings obviously belonging to two different periods of thought, are put together

by Nuyens in the second period, merely because there is no trace in them of the 'late' psychological doctrine. Moreover, the possibility that there may be different chronological stages in the same work is consistently ignored except for the *Metaphysics*. Applying thus a cut-and-dried principle means narrowing down the scope of Aristotelian studies. This mechanical method of dating, on which Nuyens obviously sets so much store, seems to me the weakest point in an interesting study.

K. O. BRINK.

Oxford.

ISOCRATES' USE OF HISTORY

Gisela SCHMITZ-KAHLMANN: *Das Beispiel der Geschichte im politischen Denken des Isokrates*. Pp. xii+130. (Philologus, Supplementband XXXI, Heft 4.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1939. Paper, RM. 8.

THIS is a book which at first sight suggests the hunt after a title that has not been used before rather than a piece of research which needed doing; and a careful reading hardly dispels the feeling. Fräulein Schmitz-Kahlmann is concerned with the use made by Isocrates, in comparison with other writers, of examples from the past to support an argument for the present. She makes a distinction between historical and mythological examples, and has a third section on *Das Vorbild der πρόγονοι*; this I should have thought wrong in point of method, for, as she herself takes pains to point out, Isocrates made no such distinction, any more than other writers, except Ephorus (whom she does not mention), not even Thucydides, though she thinks he did; and her section on the mythological past includes much that belongs to history. She analyses at length the many passages in which Isocrates uses past history to enforce his message; and, though she is mainly concerned with him as a writer, she has much to say as well of his qualities as a political thinker. But neither aspect, in her hands, is very fruitful in results.

It does not help much to point out that Isocrates' manner in using the past

is different from that of Demosthenes and other orators, who appeal, like him, to the help given to the Herakleidai by Athens, to Marathon, and to 'the example of our ancestors'; for they were speakers in the ecclesia and dicastery, he a political essayist, and a wordy one at that. Nor is anything gained by a detailed proof that he was no historian and had no profound knowledge of history; for no one, not even Isocrates himself, has imagined that he was. It would not have profited much if these sections of his writings had been used to show that he was a shallow and confused political thinker; for few since Isocrates have thought him anything else. The present author, however, is one of the few; for though she points out occasionally that the lesson he draws from the past is hardly justified on his own showing (as, e.g., the decline of Athens was rapid after the overthrow of the 'ancestral constitution' by the attack on the Areopagus, yet the Peace of Callias was the high-water mark of Athenian history), she thinks that he was a man of great intelligence, if not an original thinker. She does not see how muddled much of his thought was; and that another such as he in the third century, adopting Isocrates' own view of his contemporaries, could have written about Athens in the fourth century much as he writes about the fifth. ('At first, under the good Timotheus, Athens was the leader of willing allies; later, the generals were

merely
em of
More-
ay be
in the
d ex-
ploying
means
risto-
method
ously
e the
udy.
NK.

more feared by our allies than by our enemies'; and so forth.) On the other hand, the comparisons with Thucydides, Herodotus, and Polybius are meaningless, and unfair to Isocrates: what else should a political essayist do but *use history*? It is not his business to write it. Yet again, the author elsewhere states that historian and essayist were alike: for both thought that the sole aim of history was not knowledge but the provision of examples and judgements for the use of the statesman and political thinker (Thuc. i. 22. 4 = Arist. *Rhet.* i. 1368^a 29 = Polyb. i. 1 = Isocrates *passim*). Nor can I see any value

in the parallel drawn between *Panath.* 149-50 and Thuc. i. 22. 2 (unless Isocrates, as one can hardly believe, was thinking of the parallel himself).

The author writes clearly and soberly; but all that is of use in her book could be put into a dozen pages (Isocrates is a bad influence). She makes the surprising statement (following L. Weber) that Pericles' boastful comparison of the Trojan and Samian wars, reported by Ion, comes from his *Epitaphios*; and I do not know what she means by saying that Isocrates was the first Athenian-born of the Greek orators. A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

THE LOEB DIONYSIUS

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*, with an English translation by Earnest CARY, Ph.D., on the basis of the version of Edward Spelman. Vol. III, Books V-VI. 48. Pp. 387. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1940. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

DR. CARY continues his work in this volume with the same independence and care as before. The text, based on Jacoby's edition, is freely handled to preserve the consistency of Dionysian usage. The translation is still accurate and graceful in its adaptation of Spelman. If this review deals mainly with textual matters, it is because they provide the most scope for discussion, and it will be evident that they are points singled out from work of a high standard.

Cary still corrects boldly in establishing his text. We find, for example, attractive suggestions accepted at v. 67. 2 (*γένωνται*), 75. 2 (*ανθισ*), vi. 19. 1 (*έμμελώς*), 29. 4 (*διανείμασθαι* after *ώφεληθείν*), even vi. 4. 4 (*τάπτιγδεια*), 7. 3 (*ἀπηλάσατε*), 47. 3 (*φροντίζειν*); two neat instances come from Cary himself: *οὐθενὸς ἔτι* (vi. 29. 5), *ἀγώνισμά τι* (vi. 32. 2). These are not certain, and often there is room for difference of opinion. Sometimes, one feels, Cary corrects too lightly even for his free treatment; for example, in accepting *καθ' ἐντούς* at vi. 6. 3 or *διχοστασίας* at vi. 39. 2, or in reading *οἰς* after *ἐσθῆτα* at v. 35. 1.

Then, on the other hand, the MS. readings might better have been changed at vi. 1. 4 (*τόν*), 41. 2 (*ἀποδέξασθε*). While *κανόν* at both v. 50. 3 and vi. 13. 2 is enticing, *κονόν* may still be right. At vi. 16. 3 *ἔχθρας* is preferable to *ἔχθροῦς*. With some uneasiness, one shares his wish to keep *ἀρετᾶς* at v. 71. 2.

These are matters of opinion. In other places there are some grounds for definite criticism. Jacoby's suggestion of *δοθῆναι* at v. 35. 1 might have been strengthened by repeating his comparison of v. 39. 4. In correcting names for the sake of uniformity, Cary is perhaps too confident about Dionysius' consistency (see note on v. 52. 1), though at vi. 19. 1 he prudently retains *ἐν τῷ ταρελθόντι ἐναντῷ*. As one who assumes the presence of glosses in the text (e.g. v. 39. 4), he might have bracketed *ἀπόρως* at v. 48. 3, and might certainly have accepted *ταγούς* at v. 74. 3, since in the note he speaks of *ἀρχούς* as a gloss. Elsewhere he sometimes expresses an opinion in a note which makes one wonder why he does not carry it over to the text. For example, he rejects *αὐτῶν* in his note on vi. 5. 4 but retains it in the text, only mentioning *ἀμφοτέρων* (Hertlein). At vi. 17. 4 the critical note suggests *τότε* for *αὐτός*, while the note on the translation suggests a preference for Meutzner's *αὐτοῖς*: text and translation retain *αὐτός*, though *αὐτοῖς* at least is an easy emendation.

There appears to be a slight inconsistency in dealing with lacunae in the text. Normally, where a lacuna is indicated in translation and notes, Cary shows a lacuna in the text (see v. 57. 1; vi. 24. 1; 41. 1); but at v. 32. 4, although it is marked in the translation and mentioned in the notes, the lacuna is not shown in the text; at v. 45. 2 a missing verb is commented on in the note, supplied in the translation, but neither marked as missing nor supplied in the text. This is apparently due to less care in correcting Jacoby's text for printing than at vi. 34. 3. In giving the names of the Triginta Populi of Latium (v. 61. 3), for only twenty-nine of which is there MS. authority, Cary does not show a lacuna or, what would have been much better, accept the *Τρικρίνων* of Stephanus, emending it to *Ταρρακίνων*.

These two books of Dionysius present numerous well-known textual crucis. Cary handles them with care and his remedies are always neat. The *τε* of Stephanus for the MS. *δέ* at v. 13. 3 is much lighter than the *μέν . . . δέ* emendations; Kiessling's *τέλος ἐπιθείς* *ὑπεκδύναι* with Capps's *όμοίως* at vi. 22. 3 is attractive; Cary's own *τῶν ἀπόρων τοῖς κατισχομένοις* at vi. 34. 2 gives good sense by an easy change. It was perhaps not necessary to introduce the *οὐχ . . . ἀλλά* construction at vi. 5. 3. At vi. 1. 4 *ἐπυραφὴν τῆς ἰδρύσεως* ('the credit for beginning this temple') is not convincing: the beginning of the work is indicated, so that Jacoby's *ἀρχήν* is probably as good a suggestion as any for the MS. *γραφήν. ἀμφότερα* (vi. 9. 2) would probably go better before *εὐτυχήσασι* (with Sintenis); if not, Reiske's *ἀμφοτέρους* might have been mentioned, since the translation has to read 'save both yourselves and them'. At vi. 9. 3

EARLY LATIN
Remains of Old Latin, newly edited and translated by E. H. WARMINGTON. In four volumes. Volume IV: Archaic Inscriptions. Pp. xliv + 487; 2 plates. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1940. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.) net.

PROFESSOR WARMINGTON has, in this

παρὰ τῶν πατέρων need not necessarily replace the MS. *παρ' ἑτέροις*, although it makes a good point; but Cary's own suggestion of *καρποῦσθαι* is interesting. His *χωρεῖν* for *χωροῦντες* at vi. 10. 3 appears less satisfactory. In the confusion of vi. 34. 2 it might have been best to follow Jacoby and read *τάναυτία ἐπαγόντων τῶν ἐπ' ἑκείνοις ψηφιζομένων*. At vi. 43. 2, if *τῆς ἐκκλησίας* is kept as meaning *δημοτικῶν*, the text would be made clearer by reading *ἐπὶ τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας δικαιοτηρίων*; the phrase is harsh, perhaps as a brief reference to a well-known law, perhaps (as Cary suggests) because the corruption lies deeper.

There is little to be said on the translation, which is unfailingly accurate, close to the sense and style of Dionysius, and readable enough in itself, though it has not the strength of Spelman. One example will suffice. 'He showed them that, where the rewards men fight for, are equal, the emulation, with which they are led on to action, is equal also; while those, who expect no rewards, are inspired with no bravery. He told them, also, that the poorer sort of people were inflamed, and, going about the forum, used these discourses,' etc. (Spelman's version, with his punctuation.) 'He showed them that those who fight for equal rewards are apt to be inspired to action by an equal spirit of emulation, whereas it never occurs to those who are to reap no advantage to entertain any thought of bravery. He said that all the poor people were exasperated and were going about the Forum saying,' etc. (Cary). These passages translate v. 64. 1.

A. H. McDONALD.

University of Sydney.

INSCRIPTIONS

fourth volume, passed from the realm of letters into that of inscriptions. But let not the reader be dismayed as he enters a somewhat unfamiliar field. He will make the acquaintance of much that he has not known, but ought to have known. He will see authentic fragments of the Latin language in

stages of its development that barely figure in our books. He will touch the life of the Roman Republic at a great number of different points. If something is lost of the copiousness and eloquence of the literary record, something very definite is added—a sudden sense of the actuality of the world of our studies. It is as if a moving picture were suddenly to assume three dimensions.

Writing for the general reader, Professor Warmington has not forgotten his needs and has been more concerned to be intelligible than to be learned. At the same time, as the present reviewer can testify for at least one section (the coins), he has taken great pains to bring his account up to the level of the latest research. The material is very diverse and far from easy, nor is it possible to come through it without encountering some difficulties. In the main, the reader may have full confidence in his guide.

A few examples will give some idea of the width and interest of the material. Epitaphs are, of course, numerous. No. 18 (pp. 12, 13) will delight many: 'Heic est sepulcrum hau pulcrum pulcrai feminae. . . Domum servavit, lanam fecit. Dixa. Abei.' No. 78 (p. 36), of Lemiso, 'quem numquam nisi mors feinivit labore' has grammatical as well as human interest: 'labore' is apparently an ablative of separation after 'feinivit'. On pp. 54 ff. readers can judge for themselves the strange 'Due-nos' inscription. In No. 128 (p. 108), 'Magistri Iovei Compagai', surely we have to do with a dative rather than with a genitive. In No. 147 (p. 122) the rendering of 'Primigenia' as 'Kind to her New-Born' strikes the ear rather oddly. Of the highest interest and importance is the inscription of Duilius (pp. 128 ff.). Whether partially of later date or not it brings an echo direct out of an age before Roman historians had set stylus to wax. Inscriptions on public works bring to mind the bustling activity of the Roman in making the

world an easier place to move about in. The milestone of Popilius (No. 286, pp. 150, 151) will serve as an example. The mysteries of the *gromatici* are expounded and illustrated (pp. 158 ff.). In the class of 'instrumenta domestica', the *fibula* of Praeneste has a place apart, as strange and beautiful as a fossil of an age long dead, with the Chalcidian Greek alphabet modified, reading from right to left, and the wonderful re-duplicated perfect *fhefshaked*. Curious and interesting again are the *tesserae*, once called *consulares*, but now known for certain to belong to *nummularii*, who verified the good quality of silver coins. The decision to include coin inscriptions (pp. 216 ff.) is certainly to be approved. However laconic, the coin-legend is an inscription and should rank with other inscriptions on its merits. Other subjects of interest are the oracular responses (pp. 246 ff.), the crude but awe-inspiring curses (pp. 280 ff.), the electioneering appeals of Pompeii (pp. 286 ff.), the calendars (pp. 450 ff.). Single documents that arrest the attention are the 'Carmen Arvale' (pp. 250 ff.), with its fascinating problems of language and ritual, the decree against the 'Bacchanals' that follows, a grim document from the record of state police or persecution, by whichever name it should be called, and the long, but most important, *Lex Agraria* of 111 B.C. (No. 60, pp. 370 ff.).

There is, in fact, something in Professor Warmington's book to delight every class of reader. The lover of language and grammar will revel in the old forms and spellings. The historian will find himself moving among first-rate 'aids to history'. The student of literature, who may be inclined to regard inscriptions as 'alien' to him, will find that they are too human for that. Professor Warmington must have lavished much love and labour on this work: he may rest assured that it will not be a case of 'Love's Labour Lost'.

HAROLD MATTINGLY.

British Museum.

SYNTAX OF OLD LATIN INSCRIPTIONS

H. K. SIEGERT: *Die Syntax der Tempora und Modi der ältesten lateinischen Inschriften (bis zum Tode Caesars)*. Pp. x + 72. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1939. Paper.

A SYSTEMATIC survey of the syntax of the earliest Latin inscriptions has never been undertaken. Dr. Siegert's study of the tenses and moods fills part of this gap in the history of Latin syntax in a most satisfactory manner.

Siegert has the beginner's disregard for his less learned readers. 'Etwa im Sinne von Pfister 8 ff.' (Mr. Pfister being another Munich *doctorandus*) is a somewhat puzzling description of a certain syntactical phenomenon. And is it not a little hard on the linguist not sufficiently familiar with Roman legislation that the *Lex Agraria* or the *Lex Ursensis* should freely be mentioned as a *terminus ante* or *post quem* without any comment on their date? Omissions of this kind, however, may be excused as resulting from a marked virtue of Siegert's work, its brevity. Beginning with a very few words of introduction, it leaves off without conclusion when its subject is exhausted. Seventy meaty pages are crammed with matter accurately and methodically presented, and with comment which, though full and interesting, is always terse.

Major discoveries were not to be expected from an inquiry of this nature, but in some details even so excellent a handbook as Hofmann's Syntax is amended or its stock of significant examples added to. *Posteaquam*, e.g., is shown to occur already in early Latin, and more instances of early *antequam*, of split *quo . . . minus* (rare after Terence), and of uninflected *-urum* are registered.

Classification of the material sometimes involves controversy, in which Siegert shows resource and remarkable soundness of judgement. He argues successfully against Kroll for the perfect subjunctive in the formula *qui siet fueritve*, although generally in equivocal

instances of either second future or perfect subjunctive the presumption is admitted to be in favour of the former. The imperatives *censento* and *rogato* in the *Lex Repetund.* are conclusively proved to be passive.

Siegert is equally familiar with linguistic problems and with those of Roman administration, and his interpretations of individual passages are mostly correct. But he is unwise in applying—against the authority of his teacher F. Sommer—the term 'resultative present' to the *dat* and *dedicat* of consecrations. Originally, at any rate, we have here an actual present, referring to the moment when the dedication is made. Having become the traditional form of expression, the present may have been used even when the action was felt to be past. This would explain the relation of tenses in 626. 5 f. *quod . . . voverat . . . dedicat*. The chameleon-like nature of Siegert's 'resultative present' enables him further to assign to it both *linquit* and *locat* in 1211. 5 f. *gnatos duos creavit; horunc alterum in terra linquit, alium in terra locat*. But *linquit* means that the mother is now leaving the surviving son behind, and *locat*, I fear, is simply a 'metrical' present.

Students of Roman Law should take notice of a short chapter which explodes a bogus rule concerning instructions given to magistrates. Rudorff had observed that in the rubrics of the *Lex Repetund.* the subjunctive was used in instructions for the *praetor* and the jury, whereas those for the lower magistrate, the *quaestor*, were given in the imperative. Extended erroneously first to the *Lex Repetund.* as a whole, later to the *instrumenta publica* in general, 'Rudorff's Law' has led many a distinguished scholar astray. Siegert makes an end of it by showing that both to higher and to lower magistrates instructions are given in the imperative; outside the rubrics the subjunctive is never used.

O. SKUTSCH.

University of Manchester.

MEDIAEVAL LATIN STUDIES

L. R. LIND: *Mediaeval Latin Studies. Their Nature and Possibilities.* Pp. vi+48. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Publications, 1941. Paper, 50 cents.

THIS essay forms No. 26 of the University of Kansas series of Humanistic Studies, and its author is Assistant Professor of Latin and Greek in the University of Kansas. It is an appeal for greater attention to the study of Late and Mediaeval Latin, and the author covers a good deal of ground, discussing in thirty-six pages such topics as the chronology and linguistic elements of Mediaeval Latin, the founders of and the authorities on its study, the language and the literature, the possibilities of the subject, and suggestions for the reading of it; there is a list of suggested readings and a bibliography. In so summary a treatment omissions, of course, are inevitable; but it is a serious defect that the importance of the Vulgate is not sufficiently emphasized and that not even in the bibliography is a work so fundamental for the study of Late Latin as Rönsch's *Itala und Vulgata* even mentioned. Again, while the *Analecta Hymnica* of Blume and Dreves finds mention in the bibliography, one misses Mone's monumental *Hymni Latini* or a book so useful to the student as Walpole's *Early Latin Hymns*. While the texts of the M.G.H. are recommended in many cases, the much more convenient *Collection de Textes* (containing, e.g., Omont and Collon's *Gregory of Tours*), published by Picard, is omitted. Again, while it is true (p. 26) that Hilka's edition of the

Dialogus Miraculorum of Caesarius of Heisterbach was unpublished at the time of Hilka's death in 1939, it should have been mentioned that the first volume, containing the introduction, and the *Exempla* and *Excerpta* from the *Homilies* and other works of Caesarius, was published in 1933. One misses, too, in the enumeration of P. Lehmann's works, his important *Die Parodie im Mittelalter* (1922) and the quite delightful companion volume *Parodistische Texte* which appeared the next year. And no list of books on Tertullian is adequate which omits J. P. Waltzing's *Commentaire* on the *Apology* (Paris, 1931). *Varagine* for *Voragine* (p. 26) is no doubt a misprint, but who is *Agellinus*, who appears between Isidore and Pliny on p. 27 as one of the ancient sources for some of the mediaeval stories? Can it be the author known to scholars as Aulus Gellius?

But the author is quite right. The study of Late and Mediaeval Latin is on the whole sadly neglected in our Universities. One reason for this is no doubt the lack, in both England and America, of a collection of cheap, reliable, and representative texts, such as those published by Hilka. The Mediaeval Academy of America and some of the American Universities are doing good work in mediaeval studies, but they have not yet covered this blank; and if they can be induced to do so, enthusiasts for mediaeval studies will have much for which to thank Mr. Lind and his fellow-workers.

R. M. HENRY.

University of St. Andrews.

TARENTUM

Pierre WUILLEUMIER: *Tarente des origines à la conquête romaine.* Pp. vi+756, with a portfolio containing 2 maps, 48 plates, and index. (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, Fasc. 148.) Paris: de Boccard, 1939.

M. WUILLEUMIER's studies on individual aspects of Tarentine archaeology are already well known, and their author

has now given us this synthesis (as he calls it) of our knowledge of Tarentum during its five centuries of independent history. Starting with short chapters on the geographical and cultural background in which the early Laconian settlers found themselves, he goes on to treat the town's political and social history and to discuss at considerable length the artistic, religious, and

intellectual contributions of its citizens to the general civilization of the time. There are appendixes on the Tarentine dialect and vocabulary, followed by a full and adequate bibliography of modern authorities. The principal sites of ancient discoveries are marked on a large plan of the modern city and environs, and the forty-eight collotype plates give a useful glimpse of the main types of Tarentine art. The reproduction of the plates is generally poor, and they almost all suffer from the pernicious habit, still so sadly prevalent in archaeological works, of painting out the background. A list of sources for the plates would have been helpful.

The sum of our knowledge of ancient Tarentum is strikingly incomplete. The town's history, at any rate in the later stages, when it was in conflict with Rome, is, of course, well known; but there is probably no important ancient site where the archaeological finds have been so badly recorded, and in consequence there are many gaps in the archaeological story. Inscriptions are few and far between, sculptural and architectural remains are of the scantiest, and it is therefore all the more deplorable that the sites of the principal sanctuaries, which have given us such wonderful series of terra-cottas and other small finds, were so unscientifically rifled in the nineteenth century. Many of the earlier finds have found their way into museums without any record of their provenience, and it has been necessary for Wuilleumier and others to re-identify them as Tarentine, wherever possible, on grounds of fabric and style. The twentieth-century finds might have remedied this defect to a certain extent, but for thirty years a jealous curator would neither publish them himself nor permit others to do so, and his successors, willing though they may be, have not yet been able to make up for lost time.

The book follows the principle, well-worn in works of this kind, of cataloguing in narrative form the information we possess from ancient sources, combined with what can be deduced from archaeological discoveries. Such a treat-

ment, especially when used for a town like Tarentum, about which our knowledge is so scanty and incomplete, has its inherent defects. The picture is inevitably one-sided, concentrated as it is on Tarentum's own history and the activities of its own citizens. It would perhaps be more profitable if syntheses of this sort confined themselves to cataloguing the information available without attempting to work it up into narrative form, for in so doing they give the appearance of being a more complete picture than they really are of the history and civilization of the town with which they deal.

It is to be regretted that the author has been able to devote only a meagre twelve pages to the topography of the site. There is no good account of it elsewhere, and one could have wished for a more detailed treatment, perhaps at the expense of the political history, which occupies no less than 120 pages, yet contains little that cannot be read in any large history of Magna Graecia. The chapters on social and economic history, and on literature, philosophy, and drama, give adequate summaries of what little information ancient authors provide.

M. Wuilleumier is perhaps at his best in dealing with the story of Tarentine art as it is revealed to us not only in the series of locally-made terra-cottas, but also in the several groups of South-Italiot vases, which, following Buschor, Trendall, and others, he would ascribe to Tarentine workshops, and in the coins, bronzes, and silver-work of comparable date and style. The terra-cotta series begin almost as soon as the city was founded, and the Dionysiac and other ex-votos give us a most valuable conspectus of the growth of Tarentine, and indeed of Greek, art up to the styles of the fifth and fourth centuries. They thus supplement very nicely the sparse remains of Tarentine sculpture and reliefs that have been found. M. Wuilleumier's detailed study of the hoard of silver-gilt vessels from Tarentum, published by him in a fine monograph in 1930, has enabled him here to ascribe numerous other well-known objects of

metal-work of the later period to Tarantine craftsmen.

Scholars and research-workers will, in short, welcome this book, and will find therein all the information avail-

able about ancient Taras; they might have found it there all the more easily if it had been presented in a shorter form, and if adequate indexes had been provided.

Oxford.

D. B. HARDEN.

A HISTORY OF MESSENIA

Carl Angus ROEBUCK: *A History of Messenia from 369 to 146 B.C.* Pp. iii + 128; 1 map. Chicago: Private edition distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, 1941. Paper.

WHEN Messenia was set up as an independent state in 369 B.C. it had as its basis a submerged nationality, which had maintained its own traditions and consciousness throughout several centuries of Spartan oppression; its creation was, however, a political move in the struggle of Thebes against Sparta, and it owed its expansion under Philip II to similar circumstances having little relevance to abstract justice. For this combination of factors the reader will readily supply modern parallels, and so perhaps approach Messenia's policy of subservience to the aims of this or the other great power—a policy never edifying and finally disastrous—with a greater understanding.

For the 250 years covered by Messenian independence the evidence is nowhere abundant; for the period between Chaeronea and the rise of Cleomenes it is definitely scanty. Nevertheless, Dr. Roebuck (who is a student of Professor J. A. O. Larsen of Chicago) has produced in this doctoral dissertation a very serviceable monograph which surveys, with an admirable knowledge of recent research, the whole story of Messenian political history and contributes substantially to the elucidation of numerous special points.

He opens with a topographical survey of the district, based on a detailed knowledge of the country, acquired during his three years' stay in Greece, which enables him to amplify and in places to correct the conclusions of Valmin. He then describes the foundation of the city and its development down to 338. There is a useful summary of the controversy on the reality of the *koine eirene* postulated for 366 by De

Sanctis and Momigliano; and Dr. Roebuck stresses the importance to Messenia if in fact, as he believes, the common peace of 362 was accompanied by the creation of a *symmachy*. There is also a valuable discussion of the territorial claims against Sparta connected with Philip's invasion of Laconia in 338. A short chapter covering the 'lost years' is followed by a long and detailed treatment of Messenia's relations with Rome and the Achaean League during the last seventy-five years of her independence. The last chapter analyses the internal political development of Messene, which was founded, it seems, as a kind of federation, in which, however, the town on Ithome gradually acquired a pre-ponderance. Two appendixes discuss the positions of the Ager Dentaliatis and the towns of Calamae (Giannitzia) and Pharae (Kalamata).

What one misses is, first, some attempt to trace otherwise than incidentally Messenia's relation to the social and economic developments of the fourth, third, and second centuries. Clearly there is not much direct evidence; but the subject is important, as the events of 216 show. The amount of slavery in Messenia, the importance of commerce, the prevalent economy—these all deserve some treatment for themselves; and there are the peculiar social problems which must attend a people suddenly raised from helotry to independence. Secondly, the author might have attempted some estimate of Messenia's share in the general cultural story of Hellenism; or if, as seems probable, the cultural, like the political, contribution of Messenia is negligible, he might have related this fact to the strange situation of a state created late and artificially, and obliged to make constant and often ignoble efforts merely to preserve an independent existence.

But this, Dr. Roebuck might well

retort, lies outside the intended scope of this study; and within that scope, which is chiefly political, his book is extremely valuable and well written. The present reviewer detected scarcely any errors of fact, and those negligible. One or two misprints (e.g. Scerdilaidus, and Eparetus (twice) for Eperatus) are perhaps due to the method of printing

by photostatic reproduction from typescript. The sketch-map would have been improved by the inclusion of the surrounding districts of Sparta and Arcadia—and also by the hand of a professional cartographer. And there is no index, though the book is well worth one.

F. W. WALBANK.

University of Liverpool.

ORBIS—URBS

A. N. SHERWIN-WHITE: *The Roman Citizenship*. Pp. vii+315. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939. Cloth, 15s. net.

MR. SHERWIN-WHITE's subject—one of the biggest and most fruitful of all those that can engage the Roman historian—has been much worked at in the two generations since Mommsen, but mostly in separate aspects or departments, and his book is probably the first survey in English of the field as a whole—with this limitation, that he deals only incidentally with the *content* of the citizenship, or with its theoretical principles, and is mainly concerned with the process and methods of its *extension*.

As Stuart-Jones has written, 'the creation of a municipal system was Rome's greatest achievement in the sphere of government'. It is the most characteristic work of her political genius, and its principles appear in the very beginnings of her history, and go on operating in an ever-widening series of concentric circles, flexible and fertile in expedients for handling new problems, but always the same in essential quality. Tacitus was right when he ascribed them to the wisdom of *conditor nostri Romulus*—and when he put the words in the mouth of Claudius (*Ann.* xi. 24).

To begin with comment in general: Mr. Sherwin-White has done a very thorough, substantial, and important piece of work. It is not an easy book to read: the style is at times a little cumbrous and obscure, the line of argument rather hinted at than clearly drawn; and there is some harking back and forward which, one fancies, might have been avoided by better arrangement, at least of sentences and paragraphs within some of the chapters.

But, throughout, the book has the great merit of taking no doctrine, however venerable and orthodox, for granted without fresh examination; and the command of the sources, literary and epigraphic, and of the modern literature, seems complete and admirable. The subject is laid out in three parts: the Republic; the Principate down to the *Constitutio Antoniniana*; and a concluding study of the problem how far, and why, Rome in the end won the genuine loyalty of the peoples of her *orbis terrarum*, east as well as west, which goes on into the fourth century and indeed to Augustine.

To come to particulars: the first point to note is the writer's belief, professed on his first page, in the authenticity of the Livian tradition. It is founded on the constancy and consistency, the unmistakable continuous identity, of those 'political ideas and forms of association which influenced the growth of *civitas Romana* and *ius Latii*'. Though the sceptic may question the dates and details of their first formulation, and prefer to ascribe these to the invention of 'legally minded historians' of the second and first centuries, he does but shorten the period during which the ideas attained their conscious maturity, and so perhaps creates as many problems as he solves. When Livy's evidence is cross-examined as it is here, it does show a continuity and consistency of ideas such as no mere man of letters, and no mere lawyer-politician, could have attained without a solid core of authentic tradition; and the 'working hypothesis' that the tradition is sound fully justifies itself by its results in producing a coherent and convincing account of the development.

Coming to the instruments and methods of expansion in the Italian period—the *foedus aequum* and *iniquum*, the *civitas sine suffragio*, the *colonia c. R.*, and, above all, the *ius Latii*, the best example of Roman ingenuity in finding new uses for old ideas—one may note the careful discussions of the question of the Campani—the wavering of the tradition between *cives* and *socii* as their proper designation, which shows that the conception of *municipium* really contained two apparently contradictory notions, incorporation and alliance; of the 'Caerite franchise'; and of the *duodecim coloniae* of Cicero in *pro Caecina* and Mommsen's inference (which is rejected) of a new and narrower type of Latin right introduced in 268 B.C.

On the franchise acts of 99 and 89 B.C.—a crucial epoch in the whole process—Mr. Sherwin-White makes what is perhaps his most controversial point. The *lex Plautia Papiria* is usually said (as in *C.A.H.* ix. 4, 7), on the evidence of Cicero in *pro Archia*, as interpreted by the Bobbio Scholiast, to have offered the franchise not, like the *lex Iulia*, to allied communities (Latin and other) as communities, but to individual Italians, who were invited to come in to register at Rome while their own states remained outside or even continued in rebellion. But this, it is argued, is too large an inference from Cicero's words: he is speaking of Archias, who was *ascriptus*—not an ordinary citizen, but a kind of 'honorary freeman'—of Heraclea, but domiciled at Rome; and the clause cited is really a special provision for such *ascripti*, a small and special category of individuals, which may have been inserted in the act to make good an omission in the Julian law. It can hardly have embodied the main principle of the later act, which was much more probably one of corporate and not individual enfranchisement. How it was applied, and how it modified or extended the provisions of the Julian law, we cannot now tell (nor, for that matter, could the scholiast): an upsetting and disappointing conclusion, but one that must be faced.

The subsequent discussion of how, when, and by whom the effective municipalization of Italy was carried out proceeds mainly by an examination of H. Rudolph's views: accepted, e.g. on the *lex Mamilia Roscia Peducaea Alliena Fabia* being an act of the Triumvirate passed in Pompey's and Crassus' second consulate to standardize the 'duoviral boroughs' (already suggested by Cary in *J.R.S.* xix. 2); rejected, e.g. on the crucial question of the alleged *municipia fundana* of the Table of Heraclea, where the reference is to a special charter for Fundi.

Special note should be taken of the transitional chapter which ends Part I, on the forms of the *civitas libera* and *civitas foederata* as applied beyond Italy. This is mainly an examination and synthesis of the work of Täubler, Horn, and Henze—to which, by the way, might be added two short but important papers by A. H. M. Jones and D. Magie in *Anatolian Studies presented to W. H. Buckler* (Manchester, 1939). This shows the combination and interaction, often confused, and sometimes twisted or corrupted by sinister influences in the least admirable period of Roman policy, of the contradictory ideas of alliance and subjection—as appears in the loose Ciceronian use of *socii*. And so we pass on to the more even and fuller current of development under the Principate, when Rome seems to recover her old tact and vision as she proceeds from her first political masterpiece, the union of Italy, to her second and larger—but not greater—the unification of the *orbis terrarum*.

Part II falls into two sections: imperial policy in the extension of the citizenship, including the *ius Latii*; and Romanization, whether imposed from above or spontaneously attained by the peoples themselves. Here particular interest will be found in the treatment of Claudius (e.g. the discussion of the Lyons inscription). His work is found to show both a far-sighted understanding of the unity of the Roman world and a politic care to keep the pace of enfranchisement moderate and in strict relation to the fitness of the recipients.

Incidentally, it is suggested that it was Claudius who first made it a regular *institutum* to give the *civitas* to auxiliaries on discharge. At any rate, though he did widen and deepen the channels of admission, he did not—for all the gibes of the *Apocolocyntosis*—open the sluices to let in an indiscriminate flood. Under the Flavians and Trajan the technique of the process has been perfected, and it advances in pace and volume under Hadrian and the Antonines; and a new conception comes into view, of which the most elaborate statement is in Aristides: Rome as the *κοντὸν ἄστρον*, the name of Roman as transcending all racial or national differences; or succinctly in Rutilius' line, *urbem fecisti quod prius orbis erat*.

And so we come to the 'final act' in the Edict of Caracallus, which was to 'fill up the majesty of the Roman People'—a grandiose gesture, whatever its immediate financial or other motive, and characteristic of the grandiosities of its author. The riddle of the *δεδετικοὶ* of the Giessen papyrus is examined and left judiciously unsolved. After all, the

document 'can hardly be the text of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* itself'.

A few notes are subjoined on small textual and chronological points for reconsideration or correction. The proof revision on the whole seems to have been very thorough. P. 3: in Livy, viii. 13, the catalogue of Latin communities whose status was changed in 338 B.C. is not 'in the guise of a speech of Camillus', but is a summary of a series of *senatus consulta*. P. 25, 5th line from foot: the date of the Hernican revolt is 307, not 321 B.C. (Livy, ix. 42). P. 76, note 8: Minturnae was colonized in 296, not 299 B.C. (Vell. i. 14). P. 128, note 3: the affair of M. Marcellus *foede in Comensi* was in 51, not 49 B.C. P. 135, at foot: the municipal reorganization of Arpinum was in prospect in 46, not 49 B.C. (Cic. *Fam.* xiii. 11). P. 137, 8th line from foot: surely 'earlier' should be 'later' (Rudolph's post-Caesarian dating for all *ivviri* and *ivviri* with competence *iure dicundo*). P. 247, 8th line from foot: 'to palliate an alleged decline in municipal prosperity'. 'Arrest'? 'Disguise'?

University of Edinburgh. A. F. GILES.

ROME AND CHINA

Frederick J. TEGGART: *Rome and China. A Study of Correlations in Historical Events.* Pp. xviii+284; 14 maps in text, 1 folding map. Berkeley: University of California Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1939. Cloth, 18s. net.

READERS of Professor Teggart's earlier work are aware of his interest in historical method, in its relation to the methods of science. Here is a first instalment of an attempt, extending over many years, to apply scientific method to an historical problem, in the hope of establishing a general correlation between specific classes of historical events. The selected example is the recurrent barbarian invasions of the Roman Empire, which have been variously 'explained' by historians, but hitherto without strictly scientific investigation. The explanation already traditional in Caesar's time—'the number of the people and the lack of land'; Caesar's own explanation, the ambition of powerful leaders and the

wealth of the Roman provinces; disturbances in central Asia, first suggested by de Guignes in 1756; and the modern hypothesis of desiccation or other climatic changes,—all lack scientific grounds and fail to cover the facts. The reason for this Professor Teggart finds in the practice of studying the sequences of events in various regions separately, not the synchronisms between events in separate regions. The latter inquiry is necessarily more laborious, as the ample bibliography here shows, but it has been well worth while; though *Rome and China* only covers the short but fairly well-documented period between 58 B.C. and A.D. 107. Both positively and negatively the correspondence is shown to be precise, between wars in the Roman East and outbreaks of barbarian pressure on the lower Danube and the Rhine, and between wars in the eastern Tien Shan and outbreaks on the middle Danube between Vienna and Budapest. Only on three occasions out of thirty-

text of
lf'.
in small
nts for
e proof
o have
Livy,
n com-
ged in
speech
y of a
55, 5th
merican
x. 42).
onized
P. 128,
s foede
P. 135,
ization
6, not
7, 8th
ould be
ating
tence
foot:
muni-
use'?

ES.

: dis-
ested
modern
lima-
ounds
ason
in the
es of
, not
s in
try is
ple
been
and
fairly
B.C.
egar-
o be
man
res-
the
ern
Middle
est.
try-

one is information lacking concerning occurrences on the lower Danube. Of the wars in the Roman East, eighteen followed wars in Chinese Turkestan, 'so that, out of the forty occasions on which outbreaks took place in Europe, twenty-seven were traceable to the policy, or rather changes of policy, of the Han government' (p. viii).

Here is a new category of historical facts, namely the correlations between specific kinds of events; and Professor Teggart believes that, in addition to those which he has here published in detail, 'other correlations between events are to be expected in the history of Eurasia, at least down to the end of the fifteenth century'. This terminal date is itself significant, in view of the cause which Professor Teggart thinks he may already venture to assign for these occurrences.

The body of the book is occupied with fully documented accounts of the principal events which are to be compared, in an order which starts from correlations over relatively narrow interspaces, and includes so striking an instance as the death of the great warrior Hsien of Yarkand in A.D. 61 and Corbulo's pacification of the Roman East in A.D. 63. What emerges is the generalization that all the Roman frontier-wars were provoked by external disturbance and aggression, and that all troubles on the European front were preceded by disturbances in the Roman East (p. 66). The connecting link is shown to be the wide commercial relations of the Pontic kingdom south of the Black Sea, and of the Bosporan kingdom north of it. In this region the Danube and the Save, and the Alpine passes, were important highways, exploited by minor chiefs commanding the passage of goods (p. 75). In another direction stress is laid on the north-eastern traffic in furs, and the great silk-route to China (pp. 77-8), but for the moment what is in question is the link between Roman difficulties

in the East and along the river frontiers in Europe. Mainly pastoral or trans-human peoples, accustomed to free and easy migration, found the Roman insistence on a hard-and-fast *limes*, in its original sense, as intolerable as did the long-distance traders and the operators of existing toll-stations: it was the frequent tragedy of the 'mutually unintelligible conduct of men responsive to different modes of existence' (p. 81).

Rather later in time, in the principates of Gaius, Claudius, and Nero, it becomes possible to carry correlation farther afield, linking Roman frontier difficulties in Armenia and Parthia with events in Bactria and Kashgaria. Later still, from Vespasian to Trajan, it is the Han government itself which is responsible (pp. 136 ff.). Thus personages such as Hsien of Yarkand, and later Pan Ch'ao, the great Chinese administrator, emerge as clear-cut historical figures, with specific problems, and solutions of them; and the anonymous sources of information used by Pliny and Ptolemy find their occasions in a very real world of traders and travellers, illustrated by archaeological finds of furs and silken fabrics such as were lavishly distributed by Chinese magnates to local chiefs.

In the course of this wide survey there are many occasions for special study of geographical and ethnological questions, such as Ptolemy's account of the Volga, and the régime of the Alani. It is to be hoped that Professor Teggart may be encouraged by the reception of this instalment of his researches to release another before long. Quite apart from the intrinsic interest of these historical correlations in the past, there is a real significance in them, for modern economists and statesmen, many of whose difficulties arise, like those of Augustus and Trajan, from interference with the habitual relations between peoples, and from unforeseen reactions over wide intervals of space.

Oxford.

JOHN L. MYRES.

A FRENCH GUIDE TO ROMAN HISTORY

A. PIGANIOL: *Histoire de Rome*. Pp. lii+576. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1939. Paper, 75 fr. THE series to which this volume belongs (*Clio. Introduction aux études historiques*) aims not so much at producing text-books as at providing potential researchers with a synopsis of the work already done on the period which they propose to study. After fifty pages of general bibliography there follow twenty-three short chapters, the first of which deals with Italian pre-history and the last with the fall of the Western Empire, and to each chapter are appended elaborate notes on ancient sources and modern literature. The author has made a most conscientious study of learned periodicals, and shows an appreciation rather rare in Continental scholars of English and American work. He refers, for instance, to contributions which appeared as recently as 1938 in the Papers of the British School at Rome, and has not neglected the Proceedings of the Classical Association. He appears, however, to be unfamiliar with several books well known to all English students of Roman History, e.g. Hardy's *Roman Laws and Charters*, and his edition of the *Res Gestae*, the books of Parker and Cheesman on the Roman Army, How's edition of Cicero's Letters, and the works of Barrow and Duff on Slaves and Freedmen. Though Pauly-Wissowa is of course included in the general bibliography, few particular articles are referred to separately, and the same applies to chapters in the *Cambridge Ancient History*.

In a book containing so much detail slips are inevitable, but some of them

are very curious. Buckland's *Manual of Roman Private Life* (sic) appears under 'Vie matérielle', and Nilsson's *Den Romerska Kejsartiden* under the heading of 'Maison'. In the narrative portions many incorrect or at any rate disputable statements may be found. We are told, for instance (p. 165), that Sulla 'disarmed' consuls and praetors and allowed them purely civil functions during their year of office, and (p. 223) that Augustus created a 'caisse du prince' which received the revenues of the imperial provinces, though the articles of Wilcken and Frank which disprove the statement are duly quoted on p. 236. The well-known Augustan inscription from Narbonne (Dess. 112) is incorrectly described as the *Lex du concilium de Narbonne*. Piganiol follows Weber in attaching undue importance to the Spanish origin of Trajan and the Antonines (see R. Syme in *Hist. Zeitschr.*, 1938, pp. 564 ff.). The most startling statement which I have noticed is that Domitian's *bellum Suebicum et Sarmaticum* was fought in A.D. 89 and that its result was the annexation of the *agri decumates* (p. 279). It is obvious that the author would have been well advised to submit his proofs to the revision of specialists on particular periods of the history of Rome. English students will probably find more satisfactory guidance in the bibliographies of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, but this book will be helpful in bringing their information up to a more recent date, for little which appeared before the year 1939 has escaped the notice of the writer.

G. H. STEVENSON.

University College, Oxford.

THE CRISIS OF A.D. 69

Paola ZANCAN: *La crisi del Principato nell'anno 69 D.C.* Pp. xi+134.

Padua: 'Cedam', 1939. Paper, L. 18. THOUGH more than half of this work is devoted to a lively paraphrase of the first three books of the *Histories* of Tacitus, its object is not to throw fresh light on problems of detail, which seem

to Miss Zancan to have been sufficiently dealt with by writers who approached her subject from the 'philological' standpoint. Her purpose is rather to contrast the point of view from which Tacitus regards the events of A.D. 69-70 with that of the secondary authorities, Plutarch, Suetonius, and Cassius

Dio, the importance of whose contribution she evidently considers to have been underestimated. She is less interested in the accuracy or inaccuracy of the four narratives which she summarizes than in their underlying ideas. Her book will thus be of no value to students of Roman military history, but it may be recommended to any who care to speculate on the philosophy of life which may be attributed to Tacitus and the other historians of the Year of the Four Emperors.

Miss Zancan's treatment of Tacitus seems to the present writer to be open to serious criticism. In the first place, he is treated as a writer whose works show 'moltissima cura per l'arte, pochissima per i documenti'. Has she forgotten Pliny's words in a letter to Tacitus, 'quamvis diligentiam tuam fugere non possit, cum sit in publicis actis'? Again, though such passages as *Ann.* iv. 20 and vi. 22 show that Tacitus was not unfamiliar with the problems of philosophy, it is surely futile to attribute to him anything like systematic ideas on such subjects as Fate or Chance. His attitude to philosophy was probably akin to that of his idol Agricola, whose prudent mother discouraged his interest in the subject during his university days, so that he remembered nothing but the Doctrine of the Mean, which taught him the value of *moderatio* and *modestia*. *Retinuit, quod est difficillimum, ex sapientia modum.* Tacitus was a successful barrister, who late in life took to writing

history, and whose knowledge of philosophy was that of an amateur. If this view is anything like the truth, it is difficult to accept Miss Zancan's theory that the *Histories* are dominated by the ideas of *fatum* and *fides*, the divine and human elements in history, which are mentioned together in one passage (iii. 1).

Miss Zancan thinks that Tacitus sees the chief cause of the troubles of A.D. 69-70 in the deficiencies of the Roman 'governing class', which played such an undignified part in the events of these years, and she contrasts this conception with the stress laid on the army by Plutarch, who was far removed from Roman public life. But surely this contrast is only apparent. Tacitus knew as well as Plutarch that the real power lay with the armies, against whom the Senate was helpless when the throne was vacant. It is possible that Miss Zancan is right in seeing a somewhat different point of view in the fragmentary narrative of Cassius Dio, to whom the events which he describes were ancient history, and who perhaps forgot that in the first century monarchical government was not a matter of course.

In spite of these criticisms this is an interesting book. Much is to be said for the view that students of an ancient historian should treat his work *totaliter*, 'come un piccolo mondo in cui si esprime un autore e un momento storico'. G. H. STEVENSON.

University College, Oxford.

THE PRONUNCIATION OF GREEK AND LATIN

E. H. STURTEVANT: *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*. Second Edition. Pp. 192. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America, 1940. Cloth, \$3. The first edition of this book (reviewed in *C.R.* xxxvi. 92) has proved itself a helpful compendium. In the new edition, which, incidentally, is presented in a more handsome volume, the material is somewhat better arranged and considerably amplified, and some features which were open to criticism have been removed or altered. The clarity of exposition which distinguished the first

edition is equally pronounced in the second. Professor Sturtevant deserves our congratulations and thanks for a textbook which will be a valuable, if not indispensable, guide to all who are interested in the intricate questions of Latin and Greek pronunciation.

One cannot but admire the frankness with which the author now labels 'incredible' a theory of which he was earlier a strong advocate. In the first edition he regarded the Greek voiced mutes (β δ γ) as *fortes* and the breathed mutes (π τ κ) as *lenes*. This view (unlikely

in itself) was rendered plausible by a number of borrowed words in Latin (e.g. *gubernare* = *κυβερνᾶν*, *amurca* = *ἀμόργη*) which show an interchange between the two classes of mutes. Since Latin *b d g* were *lenes* and *p t k fortis*, the substitution in these instances could be explained as one of *lenis* for *lenis* and *fortis* for *fortis*. The exceptional character, however, of these instances, and the unlikelihood of voiced mutes being more strongly articulated than breathed mutes, make it preferable to regard the words concerned as borrowings through an intermediate language (e.g. Etruscan) which did not distinguish clearly between the two classes of mutes. S. therefore now falls into line with ordinary opinion on this matter. He still holds, however, that $\beta\delta\gamma$ were pronounced with a considerable degree of aspiration or, in other words, were very nearly voiced aspirates (= *bh*, etc.). This view, as he himself admits, rests upon very slight evidence; it is, in fact, little more than a deduction from the statements of Dionysius Thrax and Dionysius of Halicarnassus that $\pi\tau\kappa$ are *ψιλά* and $\phi\theta\chi$ *δασέα*, while $\beta\delta\gamma$ occupy an intermediate position (*μέσα τούτων*). Should we take too seriously descriptions that are not, in the modern sense, scientific? Greek writers did not manage to isolate and define the quality that distinguishes voiced sounds from breathed. It is quite possible that they wrongly interpreted the difference represented by voice as something intermediate between the presence and absence of aspiration.

The nature of the Classical Latin accent is still a subject for debate. How can we reconcile the evidence that points to a predominantly pitch accent with that which compels us to assume a stress? S.'s solution is to accept both types of evidence and to conclude that both greater expiratory force and higher pitch rested on the same syllable. There is one difficulty, however, which, in my opinion, he treats too lightly. How are we to explain the apparent failure of Latin writers for several centuries to recognize the stress? If we are not to impugn their judgement because they

described a musical accent that was *not* there, we must still do so (on S.'s hypothesis) because they omitted to describe a stress accent that *was* there. S. says 'Their Greek teachers described accent as pitch, and the description was evidently true of Latin accent; it is not strange that a plus in the Latin accent remained unnoticed.' But the stress cannot have remained unnoticed if, as S. himself has helped to show in a series of notable articles, the Latin poets paid particular regard to harmony or clash of ictus and accent. Unless one holds that the Greek accent by Cicero's time was already itself a mixture of stress and pitch (which S. will not admit), it is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that Latin writers were not sufficiently bold and original to free themselves from Greek terminology and describe clearly what they must have felt to be a difference in their own accent. Once we admit that there is something important which they do *not* say, our confidence in what they *do* say is undermined. It is suggestive that when Quintilian says that metre can change accent as in *pictaeque volucres*, where we may reasonably assume that the alteration refers to the position of stress, he still describes the phenomenon in musical terminology (*volucres media acuta legam*).

S. has a mathematical method of determining how far Latin poets consciously aimed at (or avoided) coincidence of ictus and accent. With his general conclusions few will quarrel; one feature of his method is, however, not without flaw. To take an example from his study of dramatic metres, he counts in the forms of these metres presented by many lines of Plautus and Terence the number of times that, in a succession of syllables (not necessarily a word) of the form $- \acute{u}$, the ictus falls on the first syllable. He finds that this happens in 57 per cent. of the cases. For the second term of his comparison he considers actual words of this form and finds that the ictus falls on the first syllable (thereby producing coincidence of ictus and accent) in a very much larger proportion of the occurrences.

He therefore concludes that the poets are consciously aiming at coincidence. My criticism refers solely to the interpretation put upon the first term of the comparison. The percentage which expresses the chance of the ictus falling on the first of a (meaningless) succession of syllables does not express the natural likelihood of its falling on the penult of a word of that form, and the latter alone would give us an adequate standard with which to compare the actual procedure of the poet. If the poet had to fit into his line only one word of the form $\text{—} \text{v}$, then we are justified in saying that there is a '57 to 43' chance of his achieving coincidence accidentally. But

if he then proceeds to insert in the same line another word or several others of the same form, the chance of achieving coincidence with the new candidates must be considerably different; whether it is greater or less I should not like to say. At any rate, to find a mathematical expression of the likelihood of natural coincidence in the case of words, we should have to take into account the proportion of words of this form likely to occur in one line, as well as the question of word-order and meaning: and to express all this mathematically would, I think, puzzle the most determined statistician. J. W. PIRIE.

University of Glasgow.

LATIN HUMANISM IN FIFTEENTH-CENTURY ENGLAND

R. WEISS: *Humanism in England during the Fifteenth Century*. Pp. xxiv+190. Oxford: Blackwell, 1941. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

THIS book is not very easy going, and I should advise the reader to begin with the 'Conclusion' (p. 179) before attempting the introduction or the narrative itself: the first words of the 'Conclusion' do indeed adequately describe Mr. Weiss's thesis:

English humanism in the fifteenth century was very different in its manifestations from contemporary Italian humanism. Whereas in Italy the cult of the antique had completely transformed cultural values, in England we find neo-classicism absorbed into the sphere of scholasticism and used for the furtherance of scholastic ends.

I think that he proves his case. The 'new learning' penetrated into England as it did into the more distant parts of Europe, and was taken over by the ecclesiastics to improve both their matter and their style—and the writing of good Latin and a little acquaintance with Greek were of importance to their preferment in the Church, especially as they had often to visit Rome in quasi-diplomatic functions. This was all natural and regular, and I shall return to the English ecclesiastics later: but Mr. Weiss naturally devotes a good deal of space to two secular patrons of the new learning, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, and John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester.

These were two odious characters:

and it is curious that their biographers describe both of them as being more like Italians in mind, though of pure English, or Anglo-Norman, blood. Now the Italian *condottiere* might be, and generally was, cruel and treacherous; but nobody can deny him a real taste for art and letters: of such, I think, were Duke Humphrey and Tiptoft; Duke Humphrey had Italian scholars in his employment, Tiptoft encouraged Italian humanists to come to England.

But can either of them be said to have been interested in humanism for itself? Hardly: they were patrons of the arts, and glad of anything which would help them to write and speak better Latin, if need be (though their speeches were probably ordinarily compiled by secretaries); we must be grateful to them for the manuscripts brought to this country (shamefully dispersed under Edward VI), but they were ordinary in content, however beautifully written, and did not really provide for British scholars the new treasures which were being discovered in Italy, both translations from Greek, and Latin authors who had remained unknown through the Middle Ages.

This is where Mr. Weiss's sympathy is deficient: however heretical, Wycliffe did contribute to scholastic learning, Grosseteste to letters, Pecock to practical theology; and their successors in the fifteenth century to the reception

of the new learning. Anyone wishing to know the steady advance of humanism in England in the fifteenth century should neglect the Italian names in Mr. Weiss's index and pursue the careers of Whethamstede, Bekynton, de Moleyns, William Grey, Robert Flemmyng, and John Free; Shirwood and Sellyng were of less importance, though not quite negligible: and if Mr. Weiss wishes to argue that these ecclesiastics were using the restored and better Latin more in the service of the Church than in that of polished letters, he has made out his case.

This is a work of great learning, copiously provided with references in

footnotes: Mr. Weiss should remember that, writing for English readers, the name Chrysostom, whether of saint or of pagan, should have an *h* in it; we still take an interest in the difference between *K* and *X*. I am afraid that we must admit that Latin humanism in England in the fifteenth century is of little importance compared to its magnificent beginnings in Italy, its orderly progress in France, and some sporadic developments in Germany; but it is well that it should have been surveyed, and I can hardly think that this could have been better done than by Mr. Weiss in the book before me.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

SOME SCHOOL BOOKS

A. S. C. BARNARD: *Imperitus*. Pp. viii+107. London: Bell, 1941. Limp cloth, 2s.

C. O. HEALEY: *First Year Latin Reader*. Pp. 128; illustrations. London: Longmans, 1941. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

C. E. ROBINSON: *Romani*. A reader for the third stage of Latin. Pp. vi+125. Cambridge: University Press, 1941. Cloth, 2s. 9d.

Of these three books, Mr. Healey's is intended for those who are almost at the very beginning of their study of Latin, Mr. Barnard's for those who have already mastered the rudiments, and Mr. Robinson's for those who have covered the stages represented by his *Latinum* and his *Roma*, that is to say for pupils who are in the year preceding that grim phase, 'the Certificate year'. Each book is well designed to fulfil its purpose and each contains many good things.

Mr. Healey boldly avoids the old-fashioned jumble of unconnected sentences by introducing the reader immediately to coherent dialogues and narratives grouped round such themes as the Roman house, ancient history, and some of the best incidents drawn from ancient mythology; and he aims at making the reader compile his own grammar as he learns, though the necessary information (borrowed with permission from Messrs. Flecker and Macnutt) is also clearly set out at the

end of the book, where there are two vocabularies. Lively illustrations throw real light on the text, and some well planned exercises are included as a guide to the teacher.

The *imperitus* for whom Mr. Barnard caters has begun to meet the difficulties of Latin. Gerundives rear their heads on p. 20, impersonal verbs on p. 32, and by p. 49 the *oratio obliqua* is encountered. A great deal of careful thought and, it may be conjectured, of teaching experience has gone into the planning of this book, whose many merits are difficult to explain in a short notice such as this. Perhaps its best feature is the way in which the reader is introduced to difficulties and helped over them by a well-directed reconnaissance before he meets them in pitched battle. As the author says in his *Praefatio*, 'hic igitur libellus eo consilio est scriptus, ut verbis novis prius cognitis, constructionum et generis dicendi exemplis penitus perspectis, nonnumquam prope tota materia aliter tractata, possint discipuli verba ipsa Caesaris aliorumque praeclarorum satis celeriter, ideoque satis beate legere'. The idea may not be entirely new, but it is admirably carried into effect. It may be worth observing that the point of the anecdote on p. 74 (the geese saving the Capitol) seems to have been lost by the accidental omission of the geese.

Mr. Robinson's reader is composed

of graduated extracts from various authors, mainly in prose but with a sprinkling of Catullus, Virgil, Martial, and a few lines of other poets, and it presents the reader with glimpses of subjects such as Verres, the Catilinarian conspiracy, the Empire, and the Stoic philosophy. It will be seen that Mr. Robinson is not afraid to lead his readers to passages whose interest derives rather from thought than from

action, and the experiment seems to promise success. At the same time there are numerous anecdotes and narrative extracts. Especially well chosen are the pieces from Pliny, which include the death of the elder Pliny, some of the correspondence with Trajan, and the memorable dolphin of Hippo. This is an enterprising book by a seasoned hand.

D. S. COLMAN.

The Schools, Shrewsbury.

SHORT REVIEWS

Franz STOESSL: *Apollonios Rhodios*.—*Interpretationen zur Erzählungskunst und Quellenverwertung*. Pp. 159. Bern and Leipzig: Haupt, 1941. Paper, 8 Swiss francs.

THIS thesis discusses the debt to tragic sources of certain parts of the narrative of Apollonius Rhodius, tracing back the Lemnian adventure, the departure from Iolcus, and the episode of Phineus to the *Hypsipyyle*, *Argo*, and *Phineus* of Aeschylus, the Absyrtus episode to the *Scythians* of Sophocles, and the Corcyra episode to an unidentified trilogy of Aeschylean pattern. Close analysis of the narrative of Apollonius, with the purely aetiological matter separated out, leads to a draft reconstruction, to a sort of scenario, of the dramas in question.

The theme is sound—are not tragic sources attested *passim* by the scholia, above all the *Scythians* of Sophocles in the third book?—and readers who have read intelligently the narratives of the outward and return voyages must themselves have sensed to some extent the curious conflation of dramatic and epic styles.

It is, however, another matter how far the scholar can permit himself to go in accepting these attributions and reconstructions: so much in a matter of this sort depends on personal interpretation, so much on inferences that can be neither proved nor disproved. But with Apollonius' fidelity to his originals so clearly proven in cases where accurate tracing is possible, no one would need to be surprised if chance discovery of these plays showed the deductions here made to be in general accurate and justified; for they are sensibly proportioned, kept within reasonable proportions, and not pressed to extremes.

M. M. GILLIES.

University College, Hull.

Sedulius' *Paschale Carmen*, Boek I en II ingeled, vertaald en toegelicht door N. SCHEPS. Pp. 185. Delft: Meinema, 1938. Paper.

THIS is a welcome addition to the literature on a lively Virgilian who has been less read and less edited than he deserves. Dr. Scheps makes no claim to present a critical text: with two small changes, the text is a reprint of the C.S.E.L. edition by Huemer: there is no *apparatus criticus*

and only occasional discussion of variants in the notes: the list of *loci similes* is exactly as in Huemer. The translation is unpretentiously plain and accurate (though, in passing, one might say that no language seems less suitable than Dutch for rendering the neat concision of Sedulius' Latin), and the explanatory notes are adequate and good. A full bibliography and an index to the notes are further advantages. Students of fifth-century poetry will find it a very serviceable volume, especially in its treatment of later Latin usage. It would make an excellent text-book for a University class, though for this purpose I should prefer the notes to have been in Latin as, for example, in Heuvel's similar edition of Statius, *Theb. I.*

W. H. SEMPLE.

University of Manchester.

J. Lee PULLING: *Barbitos*. Experiments in verse-translation. Pp. 132. Melbourne: University Press (London: Milford), 1939. Cloth, 6s. net.

THIS elegant little volume is from the pen of one who was for many years the Senior Classical Master at the Church of England Grammar School in Sydney, and is welcome evidence of the culture of the classics in Australia. The versions from Latin into English are twenty from Horace and one each from Catullus, Virgil, and Ovid: those from English into Latin are of various origin, some indeed from anonymous Limericks.

Among the former I find the English sometimes a little lengthy as representing its original: for the *Sirmio* Ode of Catullus Mr. Pulling employs an ingenious metrical device which does seem to me to give the general effect of the *seazon*. Among the latter, I like the rendering of *The Walrus and the Carpenter* into elegiacs, and admire that of *The Whiting and the Snail*, in a measure seldom attempted by British versifiers. Of his lighter efforts, I will content myself by quoting his version of 'There was a young man of Antigua', of which the original is probably known to most of us:

Vixit in Antigua vir quem sic increpat uxor,

'Quantum me similem te suis esse piget.'

'Dic, dea, mene geram,' respondit, 'more suillo

'An tibi displiceat forma rotunda viri.'

STEPHEN GASELEE.

WALTER SHEWRING: *Topics. Ten Essays*. Pp. iv+116. High Wycombe: Hague and Gill (London: Dent), 1940. Cloth, 5s. net.

MR. SHEWRING writes in the conviction that the only genuine humanism is theistic; the other kind simply amounts to one of the unnatural separations which are too much encouraged by the disintegrating and dehumanizing tendencies of modern civilization, like the divorce of art from use, of work from life and personal responsibility, of emotion from reason (as in Romantic poetry), or of the means from the end—and in particular of 'fine' writing from the writing which has something worth while to say. Hence he gives the student the Miltonic advice to devote himself to 'the solid things' in a language, to Plato, Aristotle, and Plotinus, whom for solid eloquence he places in the first class (together with, by what I can only regard as a strange mischance, Philo), rather than to Isocrates and Demosthenes, who represent 'the type of pretentious bad artist' and 'conceal bankruptcy with inflation'. Three of the present essays are concerned with education; and here as elsewhere Mr. Shewring revives many old

truths, as that the knowledge of miscellaneous facts is not culture but destructive of culture ('worse than ignorance' was what Plato said), and indicates his personal opinions on many subjects from School Certificate Latin to the degenerate English of Jowett and Jebb. Among the interesting suggestions for improving the undergraduate's reading-list one may note the stress laid on Cicero's philosophical works, or the insistence that to miss patristic Latin is 'to miss something of the nature of Latin prose'. The essay on 'Classics at the Universities' ends with a notable attack on false humanism, anti-Christian and (therefore) anti-intellectual, especially in its modern form of a spurious 'Hellenism' which exalts a 'Greek way of life' (largely of its own fabrication) and was refuted in advance by Plato. Mr. Shewring's graceful English style is succinct, sententious, and even, at times, oracular; I hope that he will keep his promise to write more elsewhere on Greek literature, and that he will have space to adopt a more copious and discursive manner in the defence and illustration of his principles and preferences.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XXXVI. 2: APRIL, 1941.

Lily Ross Taylor, *Caesar's Early Career*: examines the evidence for C.'s priesthoods and magistracies up to 65 B.C. A. H. Krapp, *Ἀπόλλων Σμυθεύς*: quotes parallels from Teutonic folk-lore; Σμ. came to the Troad with the Mysians from east central Europe. Lillian B. Lawler, *Iyθύες χορεύοντες*: takes Archippus' *Iyθύες* as evidence for 'fish-dances' in Athens and discusses the nature, origin, and history of such dances. J. A. O. Larsen, *The Price of Tiles at Delos from 210 to 180 B.C.*: examines epigraphic evidence. R. B. Woolsey, *Repeated Narratives in the Odyssey*: when Homer repeats a story he does so for artistic reasons. A. P. Dorjahn, *The Athenian Anakrisis*: documents were not deposited at the *anakrisis*, the function of which was to determine the admissibility of a case, not to disclose evidence. H. Bloch shows that MS. of the *Agricola* existed at Monte Cassino about 1135, when it was used by Petrus Diaconus. H. W. Müller draws attention to an unrecorded Homeric commentator, Proteas, mentioned in *Schol. Ven.*, II. xviii. 410, and in *Etym. Magn.* 513. 49. N. J. Witt explains Plautus, *Pseudolus* 1218-21 as a reference to the elephant-name *Surus* (Plin. *N.H.* viii. 11).

XXXVI. 3: JULY 1941.

L. Pearson, *Historical Allusions in the Attic Orators*: examines the evidence they give for the historical knowledge and the prejudices of the audience. Helene Weiss discusses the interpretation of Plotinus, *Enn.* iii. 7. 6. G. L. Hendrickson, *Corruptus—Corruptus—Corruptiare—Corrucciare*: takes *corruptus* in Tac. *Dial.* 20. 10 as participle of *corripi* and discusses *-rup-* forms from other com-

pounds; from *corruptus—corripi*, not from *corruptus—corrumpto*, come *V.L. corruptiare*, *It. corrucciare*, *Fr. courroucer*. R. M. Haywood, *The Oil of Leptis*: against Townsend (*C.P.* xxxv. 274) defends Gsell's view that *B. Afr.* 97. 3 refers to Lepcis, not to Leptis. K. Scott, *The Sidus Iulium and the Apotheosis of Caesar*: the official form of the deification story was suggested to Octavian by the comet which appeared at the games in honour of Victoria Caesaris; propaganda in support of it is found in representations of Julius in statues, on coins and on gems, and in the poets. F. P. Johnson, *Odysseus' Livestock*: O.'s homestead contained only oxen and mules; the *μῆλα* of xvii. 170 were not his. E. E. Burris, *Notes on Petronius*: 3. 2, rejects Bücheler's *nihil—nimirum* is ironical; 9. 2, defends *expressit*; 9. 8, retains *de ruina harena dimisit*, taking *de* as 'in consequence of'. B. L. Charney, *Notes on Seneca: Ben.* ii. 18. 5, *debēs* is required by the context and should not be changed to *debet*; *Ep.* 41. 3, defends *occurrit*; *Ep.* 85. 29, defends *viscera*. D. A. Amyx on *Juv.* xiv. 227-32 proposes in 229 *quippe et per . . . conduplicare*, 'is plainly also giving them licence to multiply'; *revoces* and *dat* refer to the same subject. L. A. MacKay, *A Syntactical Experiment of Sallust*: in *Hist. fr.* i. 77 the series of examples of the gerundival genitive of purpose shows the development of the construction.

XXXVI. 4: OCTOBER 1941

P. Treves, *Herodotus, Gelon and Pericles*: the story in *Hdt.* vii. 162 is fictitious and Gelon's words are taken from those of Pericles in his funeral speech of 439: T. interprets this as further evidence of *Hdt.*'s pro-Athenian sympathies. B. L. Ullman, *Apophoreta in Petronius and Martial*: attempts to explain the obscurities of the list of gifts in Petr. 56 from Martial xiii and xiv; proposes

opsophagi e sale ('salt fish') *dati sunt* for *aecrophagi saeclatae s. and batiam* ('ray') for *litteram*. E. H. Sturtevant, *Greek Adjectives in -AIOZ*: derives the suffix from I.E. *-ohys*. N. W. DeWitt, *Epicurean Kinetics*: discusses Epic. *Ep. ad Her.* 46 and 62. W. A. Oldfather, 'Scholia Platonica': nineteen-page review of W. C. Greene's edition. E. S. McCartney, *Modern Analogies to Ancient Tales of Monstrous Races*. G. Norwood explains Pind. *O. vi*, 82, 'in addition to my powers of song I have some repete as a trainer in music'. W. E. Blake, *Two Notes on Menander*: (1) *Epit.* 1-5 Körte³: replaces *⟨θε⟩* by *⟨ω⟩* and makes *ámoría* ... *éavróv* a question; (2) *Samia*: from the circumstances of Chrysis the date of the play can be fixed at 320/19. T. O. Mabbott, *Epictetus and Nero's Coinage*: on Arr. *Epict. Diss.* iv. 5. 17; the senate of Nicopolis may have suppressed Nero's coinage locally as Tripolis counter-stamped and Cyme mutilated it.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

LXI, 2: APRIL 1940

J. V. A. Fine, *The Background of the Social War of 220-217 B.C.* Maintains that, despite the prejudiced account of Polybius, it was disappointment at the unfortunate results of their policy of neutrality during the struggle against Cleomenes, and legitimate indignation roused by Achaean intrigues in Messenia, that drove the Aetolians into war. E. Frank, *The Fundamental Opposition of Plato and Aristotle [continued]*. Discusses (1) the differences between 'hypothetical diaeresis' and classificatory logic, (2) Aristotle's comments on the doctrine of the ideal numbers, and (3) the two philosophers' conceptions of *voūs*. W. K. Pritchett, *The Composition of the Tribes Antigonis and Demetrias*. Gives a table of the component Demes, with the sources from which they were drawn. E. Schweigert, *The Athenian Cleruchy on Samos*. Establishes the connexion between *I.G. ii.2* 1952, and *I.G. ii.2* 1609, and refers them both to the year 365/4 B.C. H.C. Youtte, *O. Mich. I. 24*. Offers revised text, to remove the difficulties caused by the fractional numbers in this land-dues account. D. M. Schullian, *Valerius Maximus in Certain Excerpts of the Twelfth Century*. Discusses those in *Val. lat.* 1869, and *Monacensis* 2204, with a fuller treatment of the latter and a list of variants peculiar to it. M. Rostovtzeff, *A Note on the New Inscription from Samothrace*. From the contemporary inscription of Hippomedon (*I.G. xii. 8, 156*) proposes *Τραλέων* for *βραλέων*. C. B. Welles, *Addendum*. Further emends the same inscription, in lines 27 ff. F. M. Heichelheim, *Another Literary Papyrus in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge*. Suggests that in *Pap. F.M. 2* fragments of lines from the *Heuba*, *Iphigenia in Aulis*, and *Antigone* are preserved.

LXI, 3: JULY 1940

G. M. Calhoun, *The Divine Entourage in Homer*. Discusses the various artistic purposes for which the gods are made to intervene in the action of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and suggests reasons for the

absence of Athene from the 'tale of wanderings' in the latter poem. C. Bailey, *The Mind of Lucretius*. Maintaining that Lucretius is primarily a poet with a visual mind, argues that much supposed dislocation and corruption in the text may be, in reality, the result of the writer's own 'visual suspension of thought' by which a mind-picture remains with him through even a long digression, to re-emerge at a later point. A. Levi, *On Twofold Statements*. Gives a general account and criticism of theories regarding the form and sources of the *Δωρού Λόγοι*. A. C. Moorhouse, *Observations on Chronology in Sound-changes in the Italic Dialects*. Holds that the development of the separate dialects was less rapid than is generally supposed. J. E. Dunlap, *Fragments of a Latin Grammar from Egypt*. Finds in *P. Mich. 4649* remains of a school-book compiled in the third century A.D., perhaps for use in connexion with the barracks at Karanis. E. Weston, *New Datings for Some Attic Honorary Decrees*. Dates *I.G. ii.2* 71 and 38 to 426/5, *I.G. ii.2* 174 to c. 412, and *I.G. ii.2* 73 to probably 415. L. Spitzer, *'Fimare' in Isidore*. Supports this conjectural word by reference to certain Romance forms. E. Schweigert, *The Athenian Secretary Phaidros of Cholleidai*. Restores the name Phaidros in the fragment previously published in *Hesperia* (vii, p. 291).

LXI, 4: OCTOBER 1940

C. M. Bowra, *Sophocles on his own Development*. Holds that the remark preserved in Plutarch (*De Projectibus in Virtute*, 7) was derived from Ion of Chios, and offers the following particular interpretations: (1) *διατεπαχύς*, 'having practised to the limit'; (2) *τὸν Αἰσχύλον σύκον*, a general reference to the big scale on which Aeschylus worked; (3) *τὸ πικρὸν καὶ κατάπεχον*, 'painful ingenuity', i.e. ingenuity in producing painful effects on the stage; (4) *τὸ τῆς λέξεως μεταβάλλειν εἶδος ὅπερ ἐστὶν ιθυώσατον καὶ βέλτιστον*, a third stage aiming at diction thoroughly in keeping with each particular character. C. A. Robinson Jr., *Alexander's Plans*. Maintains that Alexander did cherish grandiose schemes which can be partially recovered from certain passages in Arrian, especially iv. 15, 5-6 and v. 26, 1-2. H. D. Westlake, *Corinth and the Argive Coalition*. Seeks to show that in the period after the peace of Nicias hatred of Athens and the desire to involve her in a second Peloponnesian war formed the key to Corinthian policy. H. W. Miller, *Euripides and Eustathius*. Giving a list of variant readings in Euripides peculiar to him, shows that, apart from 'adapted' quotations and vague, general references, Eustathius usually quotes Euripides with remarkable accuracy. J. E. Fontenrose, *Apollo and the Sun-God in Ovid*. Analyses all the references to both deities, in order to demonstrate that Ovid never actually identified the two, though he was aware of the philosophical syncretism that did so. M. Hadas, *Livy as Scripture*. Suggests that Livy's methods of displaying his sense of Rome's great destiny are more analogous to those of the Hebrew Scriptures than of his Greek and Roman predecessors. R. S. Rogers,

Drusus Caesar's Tribunician Power. Holds that this was conferred for the first time in March or April of A.D. 22. W. B. Dinsmoor, *Ptolemais and the Archon Sortition Cycles*. Gives a new tabulation of the tribal affiliations of the Archons listed in *I.G. ii.2* 1706, and argues that Ptolemais was created early in 226/5 B.C. W. K. Pritchett, *The Term of Office of the Attic Strategoi*. Argues against the theory that there was a separate 'strategic' year distinct both from the ordinary civil year and from the year of the Councillors. A. E. Raubitschek, *A New Fragment of Attic T(ribute) L(is) D 8*. Describes the fragment, restoring φέρος ἔλογος as an official title, and dates D 7 as not later than 445 B.C. H. C. Youtie, *P. Aberdeen 18*. Confirms the conjecture that the subject is the total rise of the Nile in one annual inundation.

LXII, 1: JANUARY 1941

B. D. Meritt, *New Fragments of the Tribute Lists*. Maintaining that E.M. 13048 and 13049 are to be taken together and form part of the same inscription as List 35, frs. 2 and 3 (*Athenian Tribute Lists*, 1, pp. 104, 153) considers the text and dating of this inscription as a whole. P. Friedländer, *Pattern of Sound and Atomistic Theory in Lucretius*. Cites many examples to show that Lucretius' use of assonances, alliterations, 'puns', etc., was no mere mannerism, but, in common with his etymologizing, was used to suggest that the letters of a word are an image of the atoms composing the object described; has three textual appendices, including the suggestions *stacto* (= medicine) in i. 942 = iv. 17, and *suffre* in vi. 858. F. Solmsen, *The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric: Part I.* Analyses Aristotle's own rhetorical system, and concludes that it was the origin of the *inventio*, *dispositio*, and *elocutio* of the later five-part system, while *actio* was added by Theophrastus at his master's suggestion. W. Allen jr., *The Terentianus of the ΠΕΡΙ ΥΨΟΥΣ*. Considers that the author, perhaps a Greek-speaking Oriental and professional teacher of rhetoric, stood in the relation of *cliens* to Terentianus, who was a highly placed Roman. J. E. Fontenrose, *On the Particle ΠΩ in Homer*. Denies that *πω* has ever had a modal force, and that *οὐπω* can mean anything but 'not yet'. H. C. Youtie and O. M. Pearl, *O. Mich. I. 154*. Describes the ostrakon, and offers a revised text in lines 3-5. H. A. Sanders, *The Origin of the Third Cyrenaic Legion*. Submits evidence to show that Antony took this legion from the Galatian army of Deiotarus or his successor. F. O. Copley, *Horace, Odes 3, 5, 13-18*. Referring to the technical vocabulary of law translates *exemplum trahentis* as 'assigning to the category of a precedent' (*exemplum* dative). L. H. Gray, *The Hesychian gloss ΓΟΙΤΑ: ΟΙΣ* 'Sheep'. Reading *Γ* for *Γ*, discusses the various grades of the base from which *foita* is derived. J. S. Kieffer, *Note on Plato, Laws 722 c 1*. Suggests *τάξιν* for the corrupt *μάχην*.

LXII, 2: APRIL 1941

I. Spitzer, *Ratio>Race*. Seeks to clarify the semantic development from *ratio* (as the medieval

translation of *ἰδέα* meaning a pre-existent divine 'type' or 'species') to 'race'—a development which illustrates the renaissance laicization and trivialization of concepts. N. Lewis, *Solon's Agrarian Legislation*. While agreeing with Woodward's general picture, criticizes his distinction between principal debt (secured by fictitious sale of land) and rent-arrears debt (secured on person), and his sanguine view of the results achieved by Solon. P. A. Clement, *Chronological Notes on the Issues of Several Greek Mints*. Finds heavy odds against the occurrence, among autonomous Greek coins published in *Olynthus IX*, of pieces later than (a) 348, (b) 316 B.C. F. Solmsen, *The Aristotelian Tradition in Ancient Rhetoric*. Concludes his study of the survival (thanks to Cicero) of the *ratio Aristotelia* in spite of the almost complete triumph of Hermagoras. M. N. Tod, *Bithynica*. Discusses the word *ἀνεγόδιαρος*, 'inalienable', which is almost confined to Bithynia. H. M. Hoenigswald, *On Etruscan and Latin Month-Names*. Shows that the connexion of month-names with proper names confirms the medieval tradition of Etruscan month-names, and makes it probable that the Etruscans named their months after gods. G. Downey, *The Wall of Theodosius at Antioch*. Shows how the sixth-century Chronicle of John Malalas assigns the prefectship of Rufinus to the reign of Theodosius II instead of I, and the extension of the wall to that of Theodosius I instead of II. S. Johnson, *Sophocles, Ajax 112*. From the facts about elision and the dramatic appropriateness of *ἔφεραι* (= 'command') deduces that *ο'* is for *οτε*, not *οτι*. F. O. Copley, *Juvenal, Sat. I, i. 147-50*: on the sense of *in praecipi stare*, which combines the idea of 'the extreme point' with that of insecurity. H. L. Levy, *Catullus v. 7-11 and the Abacus*. Finding a reference to the counting-board, suggests that *conturbabimus* means that the lovers shake the board violently to obliterate the score. M. Giffler, *The Boule of 500 from Salamis to Ephialtes*. Infers from Teleclides' *Prytanais* that the Boule and (pace Kahrstedt) the prytanies were in existence but inactive during this period. W. A. Oldfather, *In Die Mortis = In Die(m) Mortis and Roman Marital Felicity*. Explains the epitaph *C.I.L. vi. 29149* as meaning not that Cerdio gave thanks on the day of his wife's death, but that he had lived with her 'down to the very day of her death', a privilege for which he was duly thankful. F. Wassermann, *Euripides, Ion 1610*. Proposes *ἡμέλησα* for *ἡμέλησε*.

LXII, 3: JULY 1941

T. Frank, *Our Changing Program*. A posthumous publication of an address delivered twelve years ago, suggesting some fruitful fields of work in Roman studies. H. T. Rowell, *Vergil and the Forum of Augustus*. Seeks to show that Picus' palace is the legendary prototype of the temple of Mars Ultor, and that Anchises' list of heroes (vi. 756 ff.) stands in the closest relation to the statues in the Forum. F. M. Wood jr., *The Military and Diplomatic Campaign of T. Quintius Flamininus in 198 B.C.* Maintains that the events of this year were guided by a deliberate policy of

so stabilizing Rome's relations with her allies that, in her own interests, she could effectively guarantee the independence of Greece. L. C. West, *The Roman Gold Standard and the Ancient Sources*. Concludes that, in relation to gold, silver was cheaper in the fourth century A.D. than in the first and second. W. F. J. Knight, *Integration and the 'Hymn to Apollo'*. While arguing that dislocations do not always prove composite authorship, holds that ll. 179-206 are actually the work of the Homer of the *Iliad* and were afterwards combined with Hesiodic and other material. G. R. Morrow, *On the Tribal Courts in Plato's 'Laws'*. Finds in these a transference, with slight modifications, of the existing jury-courts of Athens. H. H. Dubs, *An Ancient Military Contact between Romans and Chinese*. Suggests that the 'footsoldiers in fish-scale formation' mentioned in Chinese records as supporting the Hun Chih-Chih at the siege of his Central Asian capital in 36 B.C. were Roman survivors from Carrhae, drawn up with locked *scuta*. H. Meritt, *Three Studies in Old English*. Deals with (1) the context of some Latin words in the Latin-O.E. Glossary MS. Harley 3376, (2) an O.E. term for striped ornamentation, and (3) the 'ghost' word *brep̄ta*. G. Norwood, *Pindar, 'Pythian'* ii. 72 ff. Seeking to interpret the whole passage, as *τέρπεται ἐνδοθεῖ*, as homely fable, proposes *μάθων*, on the analogy of *πιθων*, in 72, and translates 'Sir Clerk'. O. Neugebauer, *Cleomenes and the Meridian of Lysimachia*. Holds that Lysimachia was never of any importance in geographical theory, and that Cleomenes refers to it merely because it was his home. D. W. Prakken, *A Note on the Megarian Historian Dieuchidas*. Offers evidence suggesting that this writer was younger than Ephorus and borrowed from him. J. A. Notopoulos, *The Slaves at the Battle of Marathon*. Argues that those killed were buried apart from the Athenian citizens, because, though already enfranchised, they had not been enrolled *κατὰ φύλα*. H. Fränkel, *Menander's 'Epitrepontes'* 722-5 Körte (646-9 Jenson). Insists that the whole speech *'Εγω γέ... δαμάσκων* must be given to Smicrines and not divided between him and Onesimus as is usually done. E. E. Burris, *Two Notes on Petronius*. Retaining the MS. reading in both passages, makes *quidem* qualify the whole clause (2. 5), and takes *loquacitas* (2. 7) to be the subject of *stetit et obmutuit*, which means 'had a deadening influence'. W. K. Pritchett, *Note on the Priests of Asklepios*. Denies that Demon was attached either to the city or to the Peiraeus Asklepieion, since he was merely the priest of a sanctuary created in his own house.

HARVARD STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

LI (1940)

This volume is in honour of Professor W. S. Ferguson. R. P. Blake, *Some Byzantine Accounting Practices Illustrated from Georgian Sources*. Deals with documents concerning benefactions bestowed in eleventh and twelfth centuries on the Imperial Lavra of Iviron on Mt. Athos. A. E. R.

Boak, *Some Early Byzantine Tax Records from Egypt*. Four texts from Karanis illustrate the collection of taxes in an Egyptian village after the tax reforms of Diocletian. T. A. Brady, *A Head of Sarapis from Corinth*. Mainly an investigation of the colouring employed on such heads, and its bearing on the problems connected with the cult statue at Alexandria. R. V. Cram, *The Roman Censors*. A list of the Roman censors, the higher curule offices held by each, and his censorial acts, with notes and discussion. S. Dow, *The First Ennéaëteric Delian Pythais*. A new text of *IG* ii.2 2336, with commentary. C. Edson, *Macedonica*. The first of a series of studies on the Greek inscriptions of Macedonia. M. Hammond, *Septimius Severus, Roman Bureaucrat*. A revised estimate of the motives for his imperial policies. J. A. O. Larsen, *The Constitution and Original Purpose of the Delian League*. The League was originally organized within a permanent Hellenic League formed at the Congress of Plataea in 479. N. M. Pusey, *Alcibiades and τὸ φιλόπολις*. Thuc. vi. 92. 4 suggests that the 'particularism' of the internally disunited Greek states does not mean 'patriotism'. R. Schlaifer, *Notes on Athenian Public Cults*. Recent discoveries concerning taxation for the support of certain cults; and notes on certain Priests and Priestesses. V. M. Scramuzza, *Claudius Soter Euergetes*. Claudius made the provinces his special care, and his efforts were appreciated by the provincials. S. B. Smith, *The Economic Motive in Thucydides*. By Athens' 'becoming great' Thucydides (i. 23. 6) meant chiefly the growth of her financial resources and economic power. Summaries of dissertations.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

LXXI: 1940

W. Allen, *The Epyllion: A Chapter in the History of Literary Criticism*. The modern use of the name has no foundation in antiquity, and no bearing on the supposed quarrel between Callimachus and Apollonius Rhodius. H. Bloch, *Herakleides Lembos and his Epitome of Aristotle's Politeiai*. On the text of the fragments and the identity of the epitomizer. G. M. Bolling, *Zenodotus' Dehorning of the Horned Hind, and the Text of Homer*. Illustrations of the persistent effort in the Homeric scholia and elsewhere to ridicule Zenodotus by amusing fictions. H. Buttenwieser, *Manuscripts of Ovid's Fasti: the Ovidian Tradition in the Middle Ages*. Supplements the textual work of F. Peeters, and denies any lack of interest in Ovid in the thirteenth century. F. O. Copley, *The Suicide-Paraclausithyon: A Study of Ps.-Theocritus, Idyll XXIII*. This serenade is unique in its morbid tone. A. Diller, *The Oldest Manuscripts of Ptolemaic Maps*. On the question whether Maximus Planudes constructed the maps on the basis of the text of the *Geography* which he rediscovered. G. Downey, *Justinian as Achilles*. On the equestrian statue of Justinian which stood on a column at Constantinople, and its value for 'the creation of good-will'. L. Edelstein, *Primum*

Gratus Homo (Lucretius, i. 66). The reference is not to Epicurus but to the Pre-Socratics. K. von Fritz, *Atticographers and Exegetae*. On the value of the *Attides* (particularly as sources for the *Ath. Pol.*) and the legal and other activities of the Exegetae, some of whom wrote *Attides*. J. F. Gilliam, *The Ordinarii and Ordinati of the Roman Army*. *Ordinarius* and *ordinatus* are synonymous, and mean a soldier serving in the ranks. M. Ginsburg, *Roman Military Clubs and Their Social Functions*. Such clubs, formed in the era of the Severi, assisted the development of social institutions. E. R. Graser, *The Significance of Two New Fragments of the Edict of Diocletian*. These fragments show that the edict was published in Italy, and was therefore applied to the whole empire; they also illustrate the activity of trade. R. M. Haywood, *The African Policy of Septimius Severus*. This emperor showed no special favour to the African provinces, which in turn showed no special enthusiasm for him. J. N. Hough, *Miscellanea Plautina: Vulgarity, Extra-Dramatic Speeches, Roman Allusions*. Coarseness (84 instances are counted), violations of dramatic illusion, and references to specifically Roman matters are discussed. F. W. Householder, *The Mock Decrees in Lucian*. Lucian's chief debt is to Euphorus. C. W. Keyes, *Half-Sister Marriage in New Comedy and the Epidicus*. There is no evidence for the marriage of ὄπορτρος in the New Comedy. L. B. Lawler, *The Dance of the μνάρδες*. The nature and history of this dance, which was probably accompanied by clappers. J. B. McDiarmid, *Theophrastus on the Eternity of the World*. The argument of this fragment is reconstructed with the help of Aristotle. R. E. Messenger, *Recent Studies in Medieval Latin Hymns*. A list covering the last twenty years. S. L. Mohler, *Slave Education in the Roman Empire*. Discusses both informal instruction and the organized *paedagogia*. C. Murley, *Plato's Phaedrus and Theocritean Pastoral*. The incidental matter of the *Phaedrus* is akin to the pastoral. M. B. Ogle, *The Trance of Lover and of Saint*. Some parallel passages from medieval romances. J. H. Oliver, *Paeanistae*. Reconstruction, with commentary, of *IG. ii.2 2481*. R. P. Oliver, *Plato and Salutati*. The Florentine misused some material culled from Plato. E. G. O'Neill, *Word-Accents and Final Syllables in Latin Verse*. Word-accents had no metrical significance in Latin versification (comedy is excluded); the phenomena are explained by the distribution of the final syllables of words. R. A. Pack, *On Guilt and Error in Senecan Tragedy*. Distinguishes the Senecan *error* from Aristotle's ἀμάρτητα. O. M. Pearl, *Varia Papyrologica*. On three texts. B. E. Perry, *The Origin of the Epimythium*. The moral in general terms added at the end of a fable is of post-classical origin. L. A. Post, *Woman's Place in Menander's Athens*. Writers like Menander and Plutarch had high ideals of marriage but no romantic cult of women as superior beings. D. W. Prakken, *Herodotus and the Spartan King Lists*.

Herodotus took over these lists from Hecataeus, and modified them. H. W. Prescott, *The Unity of Catullus LXVIII*. Finds perfect formal unity and complete harmony of subject-matter. E. K. Rand, *How much of the Annotations in Marcianum is the Work of John the Scot?* Stylistic evidence is considered. E. A. Robinson, *Cornelius Nepos and the Date of Cicero's De Legibus*. A fragment of Nepos (Peter, *H.R.R. ii. 40, fr. 17*) seems to allude to *De Legibus*, i. 5-7. R. S. Rogers, *Tiberius' Reversal of an Augustan Policy*. By allowing the Senate a share in the control of the army Tiberius evinces Republican reaction against the Augustan régime. C. Saunders, *Sources of the Names of Trojans and Latins in Vergil's Aeneid*. Classical myths, Italian history and geography, and etymology supply most of the names. F. Solmsen, *Some Works of Philostratus the Elder*. Internal evidence favours the attribution of the *Heroicus* to the elder Philostratus. E. H. Sturtevant, *o-Stem Adjectives from Declined Genitives. Reus* may be connected with *res* at the Primitive Indo-European stage. A. H. Travis, *Improbis locos Phaedri*. 'Improbis' ('rascally') refers to the essential tone of the literary fable. F. M. Wassermann, *Divine Violence and Providence in Euripides' Ion*. The *Ion* contains no attack on Apollo. N. J. DeWitt, *Massilia and Rome*. Incidents from the history of a long friendship. H. J. Wolff, *An Oxyrhynchus Receipt for Repayment of Loans*. A text from the Yale collection with translation and notes. H. C. Youtie, *Notes on O. Mich. I*. Corrections and interpretations of published texts of Greek ostraca. Abstracts of Proceedings.

HERMATHENA

LVII: MAY 1941

W. B. Stanford, *Classical Studies in Trinity College, Dublin, since the Foundation*. W. A. Goligher, *Index to the Speeches of Isaeus*, Part VII, κατηγορέος-κώμος. L. J. D. Richardson, *The Size of the Lizard*: maintains with Mayor and others that in *Juv. 3. 231* ὅπιος σεσε δομινος φεσσε λατερται the reference is to the smallness of the garden in which just one lizard could be kept, and in support cites a passage which had escaped Mayor, Ovid, *Met. 5. 457-8*.

LVIII: NOVEMBER 1941

L. J. D. Richardson, *Agma, a Forgotten Greek Letter*: in reference to the entry in the new L. and S., denies that ἄγμα is derived from ἄγνυμι; rather it is onomatopoeic, derived from its sound. He cites and discusses in detail the relevant passage in Priscian. W. A. Goligher, *Index to the Speeches of Isaeus*, Part VIII, λαγχάνω-μήτρε. W. Beare, *The Roman Stage Curtain*: discusses archaeological problems relating to the *aulaeum* and *siparium*. He shows incidentally that after the age of Tiberius the *aulaeum* (like the modern curtain) rose to reveal, fell to conceal the stage.

To the

there

language

θαλα

The

meaning

Ne

I a

Mirra

better

one r

v. 33-

at ar

(φύλα

was b

guard

hatch

thus c

he w

positi

watch

could

room,

All p

*** E

Allen

Des

Pp.

Pre

Argen

Chic

con

disp

P. I

cclx

vers

Bened

Prin

Lan

Bodkin

and

Uni

Cornf

with

Oxf

net.

De L

Met

and

Mor

logi

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of *The Classical Review*.

Dr. W. W. Tarn, discussing the arrangements of the Greek trireme (*C.R.* lv, 1941, p. 89), says that there is not 'any word for porthole in the Greek-language'. How does he render *τοῦτον δῆσαι διὰ θαλαμῆς διελόρας τῆς νέος* in Herodotus, v. 33? The new L. and S. conserves the traditional meaning 'porthole' for *θαλαμῆς*.

New College, Oxford.

JOHN L. MYRES.

I answered this question years ago (*Mariner's Mirror*, xix, 1933, p. 458, n. 1); but perhaps I had better do so again, though it is clear enough if one reads the context of the Herodotus passage, v. 33. Megabates went round the fleet, which was at anchor, to see that watch was being kept (*φυλακάς*). He found a ship on which no watch was being kept (*οὐδεῖς φυλάσσων*), so he ordered his guards to put the captain through the forward hatch and tie him there with his body inside the cabin and his head outside, i.e. above the deck, thus compelling the man to keep watch whether he would or no and in a very uncomfortable position. The whole point of the story is the *watch*; a man with his head out through a porthole could not keep watch. *θαλαμός*, which means a room, was the forward cabin, the first part of

a ship to be decked; it kept the *name* even when the ship was completely decked, like our 'fo'c'sle'. There would of course be a hatch. That there was a hatch is shown by Ar. *Pax* 1232-4, where *θαλαμά* is called *τρύπημα τῆς νέος*, the opening of the ship. What puzzles me is how anyone who read the context in Herodotus could ever have misunderstood it.

W. W. TARN.

Muirtown House, Inverness.

The context of Ar. *Pax* 1232 is even more significant, for (1) *θαλαμά* is there applied to each of the lateral arm-holes of a cuirass; (2) *τρύπημα* is more literally applicable to a porthole than to a hatch; (3) though the adjective *θαλαμή* might refer to any kind of opening in a *θάλαμος*, it is here expressly distinguished from the upward opening of the cuirass; (4) Rogers's explanation of the jest about *τρύπημα* has no point if the ship's hatch was meant. Similarly in Hdt. v. 33, *θαλαμή* may describe a deck hatch, which suits the sense, as Dr. Tarn says; but the absence of *τῆς* implies one of a number of *θαλαμα*, and is in closer accord with the only other occurrence of the word. Ancient ships (like many modern Greek vessels) 'kept watch' over themselves, both with figure-heads and with eyes painted on the sides.

New College, Oxford.

JOHN L. MYRES.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * * Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

Allen (H. M.), Garrod (H. W.) Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami. Tom. X. 1532-4. Pp. xxiv+440; 2 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941. Cloth, 28s. net.

Argenti (P. P.) Chiusi Vincta, or the occupation of Chios by the Turks (1566) and their administration of the island (1566-1912) described in contemporary diplomatic reports and official dispatches. Edited with an introduction by P. P. A., with a preface by Sir S. Gaselee. Pp. ccxxvii+264; 2 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1941. Cloth, 25s. net.

Benedict (C. H.) A History of Narbo. Pp. 93. Princeton (printed by the Lancaster Press, Lancaster, Pa.), 1941. Paper, \$1.

Bodkin (M.) The Quest for Salvation in an Ancient and a Modern Play. Pp. 54. London: Oxford University Press, 1941. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.

Cornford (F. M.) The Republic of Plato translated with Introduction and Notes. Pp. xxvii+356. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

De Lacy (P. H. and E. A.) Philodemus: On Methods of Inference. Edited, with translation and commentary. Pp. ix+200. (Philological Monographs published by the American Philological Association, No. X.) Lancaster, Pa.:

Lancaster Press (Oxford: Blackwell), 1941. Cloth, \$2.50.

Duckworth (G. E.) T. Macci Plauti Epidicus. Edited with Critical Apparatus and Commentary, in which is included the work of the late A. L. Wheeler. Pp. xiii+464. Princeton: Princeton University Press (London: Milford), 1940. Cloth, 45s. 6d. net.

Durham University Journal, Vol. XXXIV (New Series, Vol. III), No. 1. December 1941.

Excavations at Olynthus. Part X. Metals and Minor Miscellaneous Finds. An Original Contribution to Greek Life. By D. M. Robinson. Pp. xxvii+593; 37 figures, 172 plates. (The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 31.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1941. Cloth, 12os. net.

Forster (E. S.) A Short History of Modern Greece 1821-1940. Pp. xv+237; 5 maps. London: Methuen, 1941. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

Ginsburg (M.) Hunting Scenes on Roman Glass in the Rhineland. Pp. 31; 12 figures. (Studies 41, 2 = Studies in the Humanities No. 1.) Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, 1941. Paper, 75 cents.

Glover (T. R.) The Disciple. Pp. 62. Cambridge: University Press, 1941. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

Grube (G. M. A.) *The Drama of Euripides*. Pp. viii+456. London: Methuen, 1941. Cloth, 22s. 6d. net.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Supplementary Volume I. Athenian Studies presented to William Scott Ferguson. Pp. 535. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1940. Cloth, \$4.

Heidel (W. A.) *Hippocratic Medicine: Its Spirit and Method*. Pp. xvii+149. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1941. Cloth, 13s. 6d. net.

Hesperia. Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Vol. X, Nos. 3, 4. Pp. 193-300, 301-401; figures and plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1941. Paper, \$5 or 6.

Hesperia: Supplement VI. *The Sacred Gerusia*. By J. H. Oliver. Pp. xiv+204; 33 figures. Baltimore: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1941. Paper.

Lake (K. and S.) *Family 13 (The Ferrar Group)*. The Text according to Mark. With a Collation of Codex 28 of the Gospels. Pp. 161; 2 plates. (Studies and Documents, edited by K. and S. L. . . . XI.) London: Christophers, 1941. Paper, 15s. net.

Lind (L. R.) *Medieval Latin Studies. Their Nature and Possibilities*. Pp. 48. (Humanistic Studies, No. 26.) University of Kansas Publications, Lawrence, Kansas, 1941. Paper, 50 cents.

Livingstone (Sir R.) *The Classics and National Life*. Pp. 31. London: Oxford University Press, 1941. Paper, 8d. net.

Mendell (C. W.) *Our Seneca*. Pp. ix+285. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1941. Cloth, \$3 (18s. 6d. net).

Nouum Testamentum Domini Nostri Iesu Christi Latine secundum editionem S. Hieronymi . . . recensuerunt I. Wordsworth, H. I. White, H. F. D. Sparks, C. Jenkins. Partis II fasc. VII recensuit H. F. D. S. Pp. iv, 679-765. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941. Paper, 2s. net. (Part II is now published complete: cloth, 84s. net.)

Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XVIII. Edited with translations and notes by E. Lobel, C. H. Roberts, and E. P. Wegener. Pp. xii+215; 1 portrait, 14 plates. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1941. Cloth and boards, 63s.

Pritchett (W. K.) and *Meritt* (B. D.) *The Chronology of Hellenistic Athens*. Pp. xxxv+158. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940. Cloth, \$5.

Richards (G.) *Housman 1897-1936*. Pp. xxii+493; illustrations. London: Milford, 1941. Cloth, 21s. net.

Richardson (L. J. D.) *Agma, a Forgotten Greek Letter. (From Hermathena, vol. LVII.)* Pp. 15. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., 1941. Paper, 6d.

Roebuck (C. A.) *A History of Messenia from 369 to 146 B.C.* Pp. 127; 1 map. Private Edition, Distributed by the University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago, 1941. Paper.

Rostovtzeff (M.) *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. In 3 volumes. Pp. xxiv+viii+1779; 112 plates, 11 text-figures. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941. Cloth, 105s. net.

Shule (C.) *The Psychology of Aristotle. An Analysis of the Living Being*. Pp. xiv+148. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1941. Cloth, 13s. 6d. net.

Singer (C.) *A Short History of Science to the Nineteenth Century*. Pp. xiv+399; 94 text-figures. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

Sir Thomas Little Heath 1861-1940. Pp. 16; 1 photograph. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. XXVI.) London: Milford. Paper, 2s. net.

Sparrow (J.) *Poems in Latin together with a few Inscriptions. Compiled by J. S.* Pp. xii+68. London: Oxford University Press, 1941. Cloth, 6s. net.

Tate (Sir R. W.) *Orationes et Epistolae Dublinenses (1914-40)*. Pp. xix+205. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., 1941. Cloth.

Trevelyan (H.) *Goethe and the Greeks*. Pp. xvi+321. Cambridge: University Press, 1941. Cloth, 18s. net.

Yale Classical Studies. Vol. VII. Pp. 317; 4 figures, 2 plates. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1940. Cloth, 18s. 6d. net.

a
o
8.
s,
3;
n,
k
5.
1.
9
n,
0
y
o
s.
s.
n
8.
-
e
t-
i,
i
e
l-
N
8.
1,
l-
i,
r,
i,
4
y
.